

LEVEL
ONE

The

Church Quarterly Review

Edited by Philip Usher

No. 234.

JANUARY 1934

Vol. CXVII

CONTENTS :

	Page.
I. SPIRITUAL HEALING. By DOUGLAS McLAREN ..	209
II. THE KING OF TYRE. By CAMERON MACKAY ..	239
III. THE REJECTED CHRIST. By WILFRID RICHMOND ..	259
IV. JOHN BRAMHALL. By CHARLES NYE	267
V. CORIOLANUS AND SHAKESPEARE'S "TRAGIC COURSE." By GERALDINE HODGSON	292
VI. SAINT STEPHEN AND THE ROMAN COMMUNITY AT THE TIME OF THE BAPTISMAL CONTROVERSY. By N. ZERNOV	304
THE CHURCHES OF EUROPE	337
REVIEWS	350
SHORT NOTICES	364
PERIODICALS AND BOOKS RECEIVED ..	385
INDEX	393

THE CHURCH QUARTERLY REVIEW

14, BURLEIGH STREET

LONDON, W.C.2.

PRICE 6s. A COPY. SUBSCRIPTION PRICE 20s. PER ANNUM, POST FREE



HEATON, BUTLER AND BAYNE
14 GARRICK STREET, LONDON, W.C.
GLASS PAINTERS



and New York.

—
R.I.
M.D.
A.
—
PARIS
SYDNEY
PHILADELPHIA
—ETC—

COMMUNION WINES

(Certified).

THE LARGEST SHIPPERS IN GREAT BRITAIN.

J. G. FORD & SON, Ltd.

ESTABLISHED 1838.

Sedley Place, Nr. New Bond Street
OXFORD STREET, LONDON, W.1

Telephone—MAYFAIR 5135.

VINO SANTODENS

ALL COMMUNION WINES GUARANTEED THE
PURE JUICE OF THE GRAPE ONLY.

36/-, 38/-, 42/- per doz. bottles.

21/-, 22/-, 24/- per doz. $\frac{1}{2}$ -bottles.

Carriage paid on all orders of 1 dozen bottles or 2 dozen $\frac{1}{2}$ -bottles.

Samples and Price Lists free on application.

The Church Quarterly Review Advertiser

JANUARY 1934

Advertisements for the C.Q.R. should be sent to 14 Burleigh Street, London, W.C.2

THE CHURCH OF ISRAEL

Studies and Essays by the late R. H. KENNEDY

Edited, with an Introduction, by S. A. COOK

"The late Professor Kennett was a scholar whose fresh mind threw light on every problem which he attacked as well as an invigorating teacher, and this volume will constitute a welcome memorial of his outlook and work. . . Professor Cook gives a deeply interesting account of Professor Kennett's life and teaching; and all who read this little book will be grateful to him for the labour, albeit a labour of love, which he has expended on it."—*The Times Literary Supplement*.

12s. 6d. net

THE LETTERS OF STEPHEN GARDINER

Edited by J. A. MULLER

As Secretary to Wolsey, Chief Minister to Henry VIII, and Lord Chancellor under Mary, Stephen Gardiner had a hand in every diplomatic and political manœuvre of his time. His letters form a running commentary on the years 1526-1555 and express the opinions of an able jurist, a humanist, and a theologian.

31s. 6d. net

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS

BURNS OATES

ON THE POWER OF GOD

A Translation of the *De Potentia* of S. THOMAS AQUINAS.

Made by the ENGLISH DOMINICAN FATHERS.

The welcome accorded to the translations of the *Summa Theologica* and the *Summa Contra Gentiles* has encouraged the translators and publishers to proceed with the work of making S. Thomas available to English readers in their own tongue. The *De Potentia*, one of the most important of the great philosopher's shorter treatises, has the best claim to priority.

In 3 volumes. Cr. 8vo. 7/6 each volume.

LIFE OF ST. JOHN THE BAPTIST

By the VERY REV. DENIS BUZY. Freely adapted with much additional matter by REV. JOHN M. T. BARTON, D.D.

This abridged version of Père Buzy's standard biography of S. John the Baptist has been prepared in consultation with the author by Dr. Barton, who is Professor of Holy Scripture at St. Edmund's College, Ware. Père Buzy, as Professor at the Scholasticate in Bethlehem, has long been recognised as the greatest living authority on the subject in all its bearings. Dr. Barton has been able to incorporate a good deal of later research by scriptural scholars in many countries, which has been published since Dr. Buzy's biography first appeared.

Demy 8vo. 7/6.

43, NEWGATE STREET, E.C.1; and 129, VICTORIA STREET, S.W.1;
And at Manchester — Birmingham — Glasgow — Dublin.

KING'S COLLEGE

UNIVERSITY OF LONDON (DEPARTMENT OF THEOLOGY)

Dean—The Rev. R. HANSON, M.A., B.D.

FACULTY of THEOLOGY

The Degree of B.D. in the University can be obtained by Graduates in Arts after two years' study, by other Matriculated Students after three years.

Theology may also be taken as one subject for the General B.A. Examinations.

The Associateship of King's College is accepted by most Bishops as the academic qualification for admission to Holy Orders. It can be obtained by Graduates in Arts after two years' Theological study; by others who have passed certain examinations at school, or later, after three years' study; and by others after a year of 'Preliminary study' and the three years' ordinary Theological course.

Post-graduate work in Theology for B.D. Hons., Ph.D. and D.D. is directed by each Professor.

There are Entrance Exhibitions both for Graduates and for other Students.

King's College Hostel, Vincent Square, Westminster, offers the advantages of residence.

Women Students are admitted to the Theological Department to read for the B.D. or the Lambeth Diploma (S.Th.).

Staff

DOGOMATIC THEOLOGY AND EVIDENCES: Rev. HERBERT MAURICE RELTON, D.D., Professor.

HEBREW AND THE EXEGESIS OF THE OLD TESTAMENT: Rev. WILLIAM OSCAR EMIL OESTERLEY, M.A., D.D., Litt.D., Professor; SAMUEL HENRY HOOKE, M.A., B.D., Samuel Davidson Professor; Rev. FREDERICK JAMES HOLLIS, D.D., Lecturer.

SYRIAC, ARAMAIC AND RABBINICAL HEBREW: Rev. WILLIAM OSCAR EMIL OESTERLEY, M.A., D.D., Litt.D., Professor; SAMUEL HENRY HOOKE, M.A., B.D., Samuel Davidson Professor; Rev. FREDERICK JAMES HOLLIS, D.D., Lecturer.

EXEGESIS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT: Rev. Preb. EDWARD JOHN BICKNELL, M.A., D.D., Professor; EDWYN R. BEVAN, M.A., D.Litt., LL.D., Lecturer; Rev. RANDOLPH VINCENT GREENWOOD TASKER, M.A., Lecturer.

ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY: Rev. Canon CLAUDE JENKINS, D.D., F.S.A., Professor; **PATRISTIC TEXTS:** Rev. Canon CLAUDE JENKINS, D.D., F.S.A., Lecturer; Rev. RANDOLPH VINCENT GREENWOOD TASKER, M.A., Lecturer.

PASTORAL AND LITURGICAL THEOLOGY: Rev. OSCAR HARDMAN, M.A., D.D., Professor; Rev. CLEMENT FRANCIS ROGERS, M.A., Professor Emeritus; Rev. WILLIAM BELL DAMS, M.A., Lecturer.

PHILOSOPHY OF RELIGION: THE DEAN; Rev. Preb. A. CALDECOTT, D.D., D.Lit. Professor Emeritus; Rev. F. HAROLD SMITH, D.D., Lecturer in Comparative Religion.

ECCLESIASTICAL ART: Rev. Canon PERCY DEARMER, M.A., D.D., Hon. A.R.I.B.A., Professor.

TUTOR TO WOMEN STUDENTS OF THEOLOGY: Miss E. W. HIPPISLEY, S.Th. **CHAPLAIN:** Rev. E. S. ABBOTT, B.A.

FEES	£32 a year
Evening Classes	£15 15s. Od. a year

There is no entrance fee.

For residence at Hostel	£66 a year
--------------------------------	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	------------

For full information apply to the DEAN, KING'S COLLEGE,
STRAND, LONDON. W.C.2.

THE
CHURCH QUARTERLY REVIEW

No. 234

JANUARY 1934

VOL. CXVII

REVIEWS.

A History of Political Thought. By PHYLLIS DOYLE, p. 350.—*The Counter-Reformation.* By B. J. KIDD, p. 352.—*Calvin.* By R. N. CAREW HUNT, p. 354.—*The Christian Renaissance.* By G. WILSON KNIGHT, p. 356.—*The Epistle to the Romans.* By KARL BARTH, p. 359.—*Public School Religion.* Ed. by ARNOLD LUNN, p. 361.

SHORT NOTICES.

Israelitische und Altorientalische Weisheit. By VON D. DR. WALTER BAUMGARTNER, p. 364.—*Die Altorientalische Weisheit in ihrer Israelitisch-Jüdischen Ausprägung.* By VON JOHANNES FICHTNER, p. 365.—*Wortempfang und Symbol in der Alttestamentlichen Prophetie.* By VON FRIEDRICH HAEUSSERMANN, p. 366.—*The Council of Trent and Anglican Formularies.* By H. E. SYMONDS, B.D., p. 367.—*Italy and the Reformation to 1550.* By G. K. BROWN, p. 369.—*History of the Vulgate in England from Alcuin to Roger Bacon.* By HANS H. GLUNZ, p. 371.—*Sidonius Apollinaris and his Age.* By C. E. STEVENS, p. 372.—*The Christian and the Next War.* By E. N. PORTER GOFF, p. 374.—*Historic Occasions in Westminster Abbey.* Compiled by the VEN. V. F. STORR, and DR. J. PERKINS, p. 375.—*Adventures of Ideas.* By ALFRED NORTH WHITEHEAD, Sc.D., LL.D., p. 375.—*Modern Thought on Trial.* By KENNETH INGRAM, p. 377.—*The Gospel of Modernism.* By the REV. R. D. RICHARDSON, p. 379.—*The Shi'ite Religion: A History of Islam in Persia and Irak.* By DWIGHT M. DONALDSON, D.D., Ph.D., p. 380.—*An Introduction to the Sociology of Islam.* By REUBEN LEVY, M.A., p. 381.—*Jesus: A New Outline and Estimate.* By A. C. BOUQUET, D.D., p. 382.—*The Life and Teaching of Jesus Christ.* By CHARLES E. RAVEN, D.D., and ELEANOR RAVEN, p. 383.—*Memorials upon Several Occasions,* p. 383.

PERIODICALS AND BOOKS RECEIVED	385
INDEX	393

**UNITARIANS IN CATHEDRAL PULPIT:
The Liverpool Controversy.**

Two books of interest have been published by the Lindsey Press at 1/- each (by post 1/1).

ESSENTIAL CHRISTIANITY AND THE PRESENT RELIGIOUS SITUATION
by LAWRENCE REDFERN, M.A., B.D.,
whose admission to the Cathedral pulpit gave rise to the present controversy.

**LIBERTY, DIVERSITY, FRATERNITY (a plea for a new spiritual
companionship)** by JOHN C. BALLANTYNE, M.A.,

with a Foreword by seven notable ministers of diverse theological views, supporting the plea of the author. Among these are the Rev. C. E. Raven, D.D., Chancellor Emeritus, and the Rev. T. A. E. Davey, M.A., Senior Canon Liverpool Cathedral.

THE LINDSEY PRESS, 5, ESSEX STREET, STRAND, LONDON, W.C.2.

SKEFFINGTONS' LENT LIST

ADDRESSES FOR LENT AND GOOD FRIDAY.

Canon H. L. GOUDGE, D.D., Canon of Christ Church, Oxford, and Regius Professor of Divinity in Oxford University.

This new volume by Dr. Goudge contains Sermons for Ash Wednesday; Six for Lent and Easter Day. A complete set of **Addresses on the Seven Last Words** is also included.

These beautiful Addresses will doubtless meet with a wide welcome both from the clergy and churchpeople generally. *Price 3/6 net (postage 3d.).*

GRACE ABOUNDING.

Canon R. J. CAMPBELL, D.D., Chancellor and Canon Residentiary of Chichester Cathedral.

A volume of Ten striking and powerful Sermons for Lent and Easter by this well-known Preacher. There are Eight for Lent and Two for Easter, and the publishers believe that they will prove as useful and popular as Dr. Campbell's former volumes.

Price 3/6 net (postage 3d.).

FROM PULPIT TO PEW.

Rev. BASIL G. BOURCHIER, M.A., Lately Rector of St. Anne's, Soho. Foreword by The Rt. Hon. The Earl of Drogheada.

This important volume by the former Rector of St. Anne's, Soho, contains a number of striking Addresses and, in addition, much material useful in the Preparation of Sermons and for general reading. The book also includes a Scheme of the "Three Hours' Devotions," giving **Addresses on the Seven Last Words**. It should prove as popular as Mr. Bourchier's former Volumes of Sermons and will make excellent reading for the clergy and laity during Lent.

Price 5/- net (postage 4d.).

The BATTLE OF LIFE : FORTY READINGS for LENT.

Rev. BASIL G. BOURCHIER, M.A.

The Readings consist of about 350 words each, and they deal with such subjects as The Importance of Reflection—Conquest—Courage—Sorrow—Joy—Patience—Honour—Forgiveness—Gratitude—Love—Remembrance; The Need of Trial—Temptation—Contentment—Worship—Sacrifice—Endurance; The Temptations of Riches—Poverty—Age—Youth—Friendship—Success, etc. etc.

"His Readings are short, brightly written and characteristic of their author."—*Church Times*. *Price 3/6 net (postage 3d.).*

THE HEALING OF CHRIST'S WOUNDS :

Seven Addresses, with Hymns, Intercessions and Devotions arranged for the Three Hours on Good Friday.

Rev. A. W. STOTE, M.A.

These Seven Addresses based on "Words" spoken by the spectators of the Passion, with carefully-selected prayers and devotions, form an unusual variant on the conventional method of the "Three Hours."

The Bishop of Salisbury writes: "I commend these meditations for their fresh and stimulating treatment of a great subject."

Price 2/6 net (postage 3d.).

THE CROSS : SOME THOUGHTS ON THE SEVEN LAST WORDS.

Rev. J. P. HALET, M.A., Vicar of St. Martin's, Surbiton.

The main theme of this book is the Crucifixion; and it begins with a survey of the background to that event.

The book then follows the familiar lines of the Seven Words from the Cross, each word being shown against this background.

Price 3/6 net (postage 3d.).



THE
CHURCH QUARTERLY REVIEW
No. CCXXXIV.—JANUARY 1934

ART. I.—SPIRITUAL HEALING.

Heal the Sick. J. M. HICKSON.

The Ministry of Healing. Report of the Committee appointed in accordance with Resolution 63 of the Lambeth Conference.

The Church's Ministry of Healing. The REV. J. R. PRIDIE.

Divine Healing. BISHOP PAKENHAM WALSH.

The Unction of the Sick. FATHER F. W. PULLER.

The Visitation of the Sick. The REV. C. H. HARRIS in *Liturgy and Worship*.

Healing. The REV. R. M. NEWBOLT.

Notes on Spiritual Healing. The BISHOP OF DURHAM.

MR. HICKSON'S book which stands at the head of this list was first published in 1924. He had already at that time a wide reputation as the possessor of the gift of healing which brought large numbers of patients to seek his help. For twenty-four years he had been engaged in pioneer work in "Christian Healing" which is his term for what is called "Spiritual Healing" by most of his followers. It was as far back as 1882, when he was only fourteen years old, that he became aware of the gift that was in him and from that time onward he has exercised it. It was however in 1900 that the work of healing became the dominant interest and occupation of his life.

The thesis of Mr. Hickson's book, which is largely auto-biographical, is that the gift or power bestowed upon him is not of the nature of a unique phenomenon, but only an instance of something which has always been in the possession of the Christian church. It is a talent committed to her for use in the Master's service; but it has been hidden away in a napkin and forgotten. Mr. Hickson's book was a challenge to the Church of England to awake to its responsibility and its opportunity as a steward of this gift, and to remember that it is in the world to perpetuate the grace and blessing which flowed from the great physician when he went about doing good, bringing strength and healing to men's bodies, as well as peace and pardon to their souls.

It is not by the written word only that Mr. Hickson has delivered his message. He has spoken at meetings far and wide. He has held services and given addresses in churches in all parts of the world and certainly has no reason to be dissatisfied with the results of his propaganda. To him, more than to any other individual, is due that keen and deep interest in the subject which led the Archbishop of Canterbury at the request of the Lambeth Conference to appoint a committee "to consider and report upon the use with prayer of the laying on of hands and of the unction of the sick and of other spiritual means of healing."

The Report appeared in 1923 and may be said to have expressed itself in terms of general approval.

Within the last ten years, a remarkable impetus has been given to the cause for which Mr. Hickson stands. Guilds and societies for disseminating and applying Mr. Hickson's teaching have been formed; a small literature has sprung up; many parish priests include the treatment of the sick as part of their ministerial functions. With some it has come to be a passionate interest which takes them far beyond the limits of their own parishes, or more often perhaps causes them to

welcome as the objects of their care sick people from a distance.

It usually happens that when a fresh and unfamiliar idea is presented to the British public it is looked at either with indifference or suspicion; the clearer and closer the relation which it has to conduct, the deeper being the suspicion. In this case there has been a singular absence of any such feeling and an almost entire absence of any actual opposition. If a colloquialism may be allowed the idea has "caught on." Mr. Newbolt sees reason against giving an unqualified assent to it and to the way in which it expresses itself; but as far as I am aware the Bishop of Durham's is the only voice which has been quite clearly and definitely raised against it.

It is not at all surprising that it should be so. The doctrine is in many ways attractive. It can base itself on facts acknowledged by students of medicine and psychology as well as of religion; and with Christian believers the appeal which it makes to the New Testament and to the customs and traditions of the church is bound to have weight.

The interaction of soul and body and their interdependence is felt to be more varied and more vital to-day than it ever has been, and the fact so recognised is applied in their own way both by the workers whose occupation lies with the mysteries of men's bodies and by those who watch for their souls. They both know how profoundly a person's mental processes, the colour and direction of his thoughts, the character and equality of his emotions, his entire religious outlook, may be affected by an accident or an illness of which the victim is the body. They know, on the other hand, how the character of the inner life tells even upon the expression of the face and the tones of the voice, how the vibrations of spiritual experience extend to the body and how there are sent

"Through all this fleshly dress
Bright shoots of everlastingness."

Soul and body certainly are implicated in each other's fortunes and each can exhibit the signs of its influence upon

the other. The Christian healer feels also that he can go further and can invoke on his side the best known names of modern science when he asserts that in this fellowship of the body and spirit it is the spirit that takes the lead and is the "predominant partner."

Again, if we consult the gospels, it is clear that the sympathy of our Lord and his active help were abundantly given to those who were sick of divers diseases. The number of cases stated to have been cured by him is considerable, and the closing verse of the fourth gospel tells us plainly that the list could be greatly extended.

As our Lord had concerned himself with caring for the sick and healing them, so it is clear from the Acts, and St. Paul's Epistles did the apostolic church; and when we pass to the church of later days, the forms of worship which have come down to us prove that the same view of its obligations towards the sick was taken.

Further, if in the mind and character of Christ we see revealed the character and mind of God and if God is what the acts as well as the words of Christ declare, there lies very near at hand the conclusion that it cannot be part of his will that his children should suffer from disease and pain. These things are here, it is true, but they ought not to be. God is love and God is life. Life both spiritual and physical is from him and his will is that both in their spirits and in their bodies men may have life and have it abundantly. All that hinders or damages life must therefore be against his will. That is an entirely natural conclusion.

It may seem audacious on the part of one who cannot claim to be an expert on the subject to ask whether considerations which commended themselves as decisive to the opinion of the Archbishop's Committee are really final, but there is so much in the theory of spiritual healing which lies in my own mind with a large note of interrogation against it that I feel constrained to ask whether a somewhat too uncritical

acceptance has not been given to it, whether some of the facts on which it relies are real facts and whether certain other facts which make against it have not been overlooked.

I.

In the writings and in the utterances of those who maintain the theory of spiritual healing there is no statement more frequently or more confidently made than that which declares that the commission and the power to heal was given by our Lord to his church. It is made a basal fact of their theory, and in their propaganda it has come to hold the place of an axiom. Thus Mr. Hickson has as the title of his popular book the words of the Lord, "Heal the sick," and thinks that with them the question of the validity of his theory is closed. Dr. Harris, in like manner, refers to "the all embracing character of the ministry of healing which our Lord entrusted to his apostles." Bishop Pakenham-Walsh writes "there is no indication that the ministry and gifts of healing which were given to the church by our blessed Lord, were ever intended to be withdrawn." Such language is typical. This commission and this authority, we are always being told, have never been abrogated or repealed and therefore are still in force.

It seems almost incredible that the fact which the Bishop of Durham recalls should have escaped the notice of this whole school of writers, namely that the charge to heal the sick was not a charge to the Christian church or to the Christian ministry at all. Our Lord was still engaged in training the men who were soon to be the first leaders and teachers of his church. As part of that work of preparation he sends them out on a short experimental mission and we have an account of the conversation between him and the disciples when they returned from it. It is important to notice that according to St. Luke xxii, 35, our Lord on the night of the betrayal referred to this temporary mission; and its merely temporary character is shewn by the fact that some of the instructions which had been given to the men who had been sent out upon

that short missionary tour were explicitly revoked. If it is objected that the command to heal the sick was not among the directions which were then cancelled, the reply is that any reference to that part of his instructions was at the moment quite irrelevant. The point is that whether we take the charge in question as having been addressed to the twelve or to the seventy it does not touch the question of the functions of the ministry for a church which as yet did not exist.

If we turn to the passages in which the nature of that ministry is contemplated (St. Matthew xxviii, 19-20, St. John xx, 21-22) there is no reference to the healing of the sick.

This charge to heal the sick which is habitually quoted as establishing the theory and the practice of spiritual healing on an impregnable basis was accompanied by the command to raise the dead (St. Matthew x, 8). There is no hint given that the two commands were intended to stand on different planes as regards their permanent validity. If the healing of the sick constitutes, as on the assumption of Mr. Hickson and Dr. Harris and all spiritual healers it does, a vital and standing element in the commission to the Christian ministry, why are we not to suppose that the same thing applies to the other command given by our Lord in the same breath? No spiritual healer, as far as I am aware, claims that such a power has been entrusted to him, still less does any healer claim to have exercised it. Usually the fact that such a command was ever given is altogether ignored. But Mr. Hickson and his confrères cannot have it both ways. They must not say that by his charge to the disciples our Lord instituted a ministry of healing in his church and refuse to acknowledge that by the same charge he appointed a ministry of the resurrection of the dead.

Of course it is possible to argue that in his language in the second clause our Lord is speaking figuratively. It is possible to say that in referring to the raising of the dead he meant those who were dead spiritually and, as all the world is well aware, the figure is a frequent one in the New Testament. But it is hardly possible to argue with any show of reason that of the two clauses standing side by side and uttered, as I have

said, in the same breath, the first has a plain literal meaning and the second is a figure. Once again the authors cannot have it both ways. They cannot be allowed to say that when our Lord speaks of the sick he means literal sickness and that when he speaks of the dead he means spiritual death. It must either be physical sickness and physical death or spiritual death and spiritual sickness. Our authors must choose. Which is it to be?

II.

The last verses of St. Mark as we have them state that among the signs which would follow them that believe our Lord included the casting out of devils and the laying of hands on the sick who as a result of it would recover. Our Lord is here making a prophecy which is not quite the same as giving a charge, and the history contained in the Acts, even if it be accepted as only approximately correct, shews how frequently the prophecy was fulfilled and how soon the fulfilment began. It is unnecessary to enumerate the instances given in that book, nor is it necessary to do more than note the fact that the church continued to treat the sick in the way described by our Lord after the apostolic age had passed away. There are however two points which demand attention and which never receive it at the hands of spiritual healers. The first is that it is not by the method of spiritual healing that these cures are represented as having been wrought. To this we will turn in a moment.¹

The second is that no authoritative direction on the subject was necessary to make the church occupy itself with the healing of the sick. With the current conception of the nature of disease, a conception which completely possessed the Christian mind for ages, no other course was really possible. It was bound to make the treatment of sickness part of its work and the treatment which it gave is bound to be a religious treatment.

The action and attitude of the church towards the facts

¹ See below, § iv.

of illness and disease was determined by the vast range which was attributed to evil spirits and their influence. That belief was one of the dominating ideas of the apostolic age. Dr. Schweitzer in his book on the *Mysticism of Paul the Apostle* has shewn the extent to which the thought of the New Testament is affected by it. St. Paul, although sure of the sovereignty and the ultimate victory of God, regards the rule of evil spirits as a real and terrible fact. It is Satan who thwarts the plans which he has formed for the preaching of the gospel. The effect of taking part in heathen sacrificial worship is that an actual fellowship is established with the demons to whom the worship is offered. The explanation which he gives of the physical disability from which he suffered is that it is the work of Satan. The warfare which the Christian wages is with the spiritual hosts of wickedness and although the cross was the scene of a triumph over principalities and powers, yet for St. John the whole world outside the limits of the Christian community lies in the evil one. Sickness being thus interpreted on the hypothesis that it was due to the malignity of spiritual beings, who should meet and counteract it but those whom the Lord has made his representatives in the world, and by what means except by spiritual means and chiefly by the power of his victorious name?

Hence it does not surprise us in the least that, as soon as the church began to express itself on the subject of disease in the language of its worship, the case of its suffering and afflicted members is found to have received large recognition, and the cure and care of them to have been one of its chief pre-occupations. Let it be repeated however that the principle and the method adopted were neither the principle nor the method characteristic of the modern spiritual healer.

Now the explanation of disease given by the early church is no longer ours. It continued to be accepted as the true and satisfying account throughout the dark ages and beyond them and was responsible for the multiplication of such religious ceremonies as those of exorcism. In certain back-

waters of Christian thought it still exists; but it is safe to say that it is not the view of the Christian world to-day. Some forms of violent hysteria and mania may still be attributed by some devout people to diabolical possession, but as a generally accepted explanation it has gone. When members of the Universities Mission to Central Africa tell us that the natives believe that the illness of any given person is due to the presence in him of an evil spirit, and that they resort in such cases to what seem to them the most probable methods of expelling the demon, these stories are not told as illustrating the fundamentally Christian nature of the heathen belief, but as examples of the unhappy state of superstition from which the Christian religion would rescue them.

The mode of treatment applied by the primitive church when confronted by the spectacle of disease was, in the circumstances and considering the theory of the time, perfectly natural and obvious. As long as the conviction was held that behind an illness there was a being with an evil and malicious will, it was the treatment which suggested itself irresistibly to a religious mind. But with the disappearance of the theory which produced it the practice of the same method appears to be an anachronism, or like a building suspended in the air having lost the foundation on which it originally rested.

The ceremony of exorcism in particular is in point. The subtle and hostile spirit who held more or less complete possession of the sufferer would it was felt, do his best to neutralise the effects of any medicines that might be given, possibly even to corrupt them. Hence it was necessary to secure them against his power. Given the premise the ceremony of exorcism followed almost irresistibly.

We are fearfully and wonderfully made. The Psalmist, when he said so, was almost certainly thinking only of our physical structure. But wonderful as the body is, it is nothing like as queer as the human conscience or the human mind. They can hold at one and the same time two sets of principles diametrically opposed to each other without allowing them to

come in contact. They can sanction the most ridiculous and the most outrageous courses of conduct and can compel us to persist in them long after the sanction on which they rested has abdicated its authority. So we find that to-day the oil with which the sick are to be anointed, in being consecrated is also exorcised, although the belief that it must be liberated or safeguarded from the power of demons is either held in a merely otiose fashion, or not held at all.

May not something of the same sort as has been said in regard to the belief in evil spirits and their insidious action be said also of the ancient belief in the healing properties of oil? As a remedy oil was widely used in pre-Christian times. Among non-Christian races and in many parts of the world it is still popular. As every reader of the New Testament is aware, the early church adopted it and the unction of the sick has been practised from apostolic times downwards both in East and West. In the Church of England the use of it, after being virtually dropped for some centuries, has been revived on a considerable scale within the last fifty years.

In the charge given to the apostles in St. Mark vi, 7-11, there is no mention of any command from our Lord directing the use of oil; but the passage goes on to state that in their fulfilment of that charge "they anointed with oil many that were sick and healed them." It would indeed have needed no specific direction from our Lord to lead them to make use of this standing remedy of their time. But the science of medicine like every other science has advanced and developed since that time. The discovery has been made that there are drugs and medicines and remedies undreamed of in those days, and oil no longer holds the place which it held in the pharmacopœia of the ancients. The religious use of it however still persists in the church's rite of the unction of the sick.

Now the province of medicine is one which the church for a long period seems to have studiously refrained from attempting to make its own. It is a curious fact that in the dark days

when the monasteries were almost the only places to which art and learning could flee for a refuge and a home, the one line of study which was looked upon askance by the monks and by the clerical order as a whole was that of medicine. It was due in part I imagine to the association which existed in the mediæval mind between medicine and magic, but it was perhaps still more largely due to a feeling concerning the human body which I may perhaps be allowed to illustrate from an incident belonging to an early stage of my own clerical career. In a country parish in which I once served as assistant curate the vicar, or perhaps the vicar's wife, thought that it might be to the advantage of the elder children in the national school to have some simple instruction in elementary hygiene. A course of lectures was arranged which, it was hoped, would, by their form as well as by their substance, meet the need, but the success achieved was not very great. The view of the parents on such matters was expressed by an indignant mother who called upon the vicar after the first or second lecture and declared "I won't have my Mary Jane learning no more about her own inside. It don't do no good and it's rude."

"It's rude." That terse sentence represents with very fair accuracy the view and the feeling of the mediæval monk. There was something indelicate in referring to the functions of the body and its anatomy, something still more doubtful about examining and studying these mysteries. It was safer to draw a veil over the whole subject. Consequently the clergy on principle averted their attention from a branch of study which occupied itself with the physical organism and its processes. It was enough for them to know that they had inherited oil as an effective panacea, and they went on using it.

But however small its interest in medical matters and however small its sympathies with medical studies, the ecclesiastical society of those centuries could not seal itself up hermetically against the experience of the world and the results of that experience. It had to recognise *bon gré mal gré* that oil could not do everything that primitive medical science had

claimed for it and that there were other resources, unknown in apostolic times, which were far more effective in the case of particular diseases. That discovery was the cause of an interesting modification in the conception and in the use of the rite of unction.

Father Puller in his well-known essay has called attention to the fact that the use of unction as a sacrament for the dying constitutes a departure from the custom of the primitive church, with which it had a medicinal purpose. Dr. Harris¹ contends that Father Puller's generalisation is too sweeping and it may be that it does require some slight qualification. But it can hardly be doubted that, roughly speaking, the use of unction for the spiritual comfort of the dying is not in line with the primitive purpose as it is revealed in the early liturgical forms.

The change is easily intelligible in the light of what has just been said. Experience had taught that oil was not a sovereign remedy even when unction was accompanied by prayer and by the laying on of hands. There were remedies more valuable and almost as easily accessible. The medical use of oil therefore fell into the background. But, to repeat in a slightly different form what was said with reference to the rite of exorcism, it is the commonest fact of experience that an action, particularly a ritual action, which once embodied a belief or an idea will continue to get itself performed after the idea which it enshrined has gone out of it.

So it was with the unction of the sick. But in this case another idea or theory was found which supplied the ritual act with a new theoretical basis and which saved it from the fate of being discarded. The *raison d'être* of unction was now declared to be not the healing of the patient's sickness but the forgiveness of his sins, and with that theoretical or doctrinal basis inserted beneath it unction came to be and is now practised in the Church of Rome.

The unction of the sick is never mentioned without

¹ *The Visitation of the Sick in Liturgy and Worship*, pp. 504, 5.

reference being made to the Epistle of St. James, and to the counsel given to the Christians to whom that letter is addressed to send for the elders of the church in any time of sickness in order that, by their prayers and by the anointing which they will administer, the sick member may be healed. To this is added the argument from ecclesiastical custom and tradition. But the fact seems to be systematically evaded that in spite of St. James and in spite of established custom and usage, a large part of Christendom after prolonged experience of the effects of unction as directed by St. James deliberately discontinued it, or to be more exact, continued to perform the rite but with an entirely different object. The bearing of this fact on the question of its physical value is surely obvious and important and it is much to be wished that spiritual healers will take notice of it.

III.

Dean Church in one of his published letters recalls the saying of an ancient Greek living almost at the dawn of human thought to the effect that men are likely to receive many surprises after they are dead. One of the things, the Dean goes on to say, which will probably surprise us as we look back upon our present life from the other shore, is the ease with which we thought we were able to speak of the will and of the ways of God. The suggestion made by that wise and saintly scholar often recurs to one as one listens to the confident assertions which spiritual healers are wont to make in speaking of the will and the thought and the feeling of God in regard to that perplexing fact of disease and pain. They are quite sure that they can declare that to him it is an evil utterly abhorrent and that his attitude towards it is one of resolute antagonism.¹ That being so, and the church being here to carry out the purpose of his will, the healing of disease must be part of its vocation. So by another route we come to the position which, as was said at the opening of this paper, is usually taken as an axiom by the writers whom we are

¹ Pridie, *The Church's Ministry of Healing*, pp. 95 and 97.

considering, namely that the church possesses a ministry of healing, and possesses it by Divine appointment.

But can the case be dismissed so easily? There was a little book entitled *The Mystery of Pain* by James Hinton which was well known half a century ago. That title embodies what has been almost everywhere and almost always the feeling which men have had about pain. It is a mystery and a problem, and a dark one at that. But to spiritual healers there seems to be little that is problematical about it. It is an enemy and a curse and is to be so treated and nothing more need be said about it.

There have been Christian thinkers, beginning perhaps with Irenæus, who have held that even in the case of the worst and deepest form of evil, moral evil or sin, there are considerations which should make us hesitate before we think that, when we have described it as evil, we have said all that may be or should be said about it. They have taken the line which in our day has been taken by Archbishop Temple in saying "A sinful world redeemed by the agony of love's complete sacrifice, is a better world by the only standards of excellence we have, than a world that had never sinned." *O felix culpa quae tantum et talem meruit Redemptorem.* And again: "Of course it is only so far as selfwill is conquered by love that it is justified in the world's history. But when conquered it is justified. It may become good for me that I have sinned, that I may love God as my redeemer. It may prove good for him that I have sinned that he may have the joy of my redemption."

This which is said with regard to the evil of sin may surely be applied to the evil of suffering. Both are mysteries and, as has just been said, the fault of the philosophy of the spiritual healer is that the second is made to appear too simple. Perhaps we should be on the right track if, instead of allowing ourselves to try to deal with it in his simple and absolute manner, we were to compare it with a discord in music. Taken alone, a certain combination of sounds or notes may

be discordant, or even horrible; but, taken in a particular musical context, as part of a sequence or a phrase, it heightens the general effect and leaves us with something that is beautiful.

This is certainly one aspect of the question of pain which ought not to be left out of account. Those who have never read the late Dr. Illingworth's essay in *Lux Mundi*, might well read and ponder what they will find on pages 117 and 118 of the 1889 edition as well as what Robert Browning emphasised in the two poems "Mihrab Shah" and "A Bean Stripe" in *Ferishtah's Fancies*, and especially the noble sermon in the hospital put by Mrs. Hamilton King into the mouth of Ugo Bassi in *The Disciples*.

This is without doubt a vast subject and obviously cannot be developed in an article on the general subject of spiritual healing. What may however be said here is that when our friends the spiritual healers speak to us, somewhat dogmatically, about the will and purpose of God, they do not appear to recognise the possibility that there may be gradations in his purposes and that our physical comfort or well-being may not be to him the highest point or form of human blessedness.¹

It is easy to argue about suffering and illness in the abstract but, when we have to do with them in practice and at close quarters, these things which we are assured are in utter opposition to the will of God are so often found to bring with them or to leave behind them results on which we can only look with surprise and thankfulness, so that we are unable to resist the certainty that the spiritual healer has seen only part of the truth and has made the not uncommon mistake of mistaking the part for the whole. In the world in which we actually live, nearly all the best things have come to us not from the pleasures but from the pains of men. We know also that there is nothing like the spectacle of physical pain or disease to generate the forces of sympathy and love; and, as for those who are themselves the sufferers, when the spiritual healer tells us that they are the victims of a bitter enemy, we

¹ Pridie, p. 95.

can only point to a whole vast army of them who assure us that the experience through which they have had to pass has given them something which has made what they have borne well worth the bearing. Looking back they know themselves to be the richer for it and they find with wonder that they are able to thank God for it.

This is so commonplace that one feels almost inclined to refer to it with an apology. But though commonplace it is left almost out of sight by the spiritual healer to whom sickness and suffering are evils and nothing else. Sometimes it is true there does come the recollection that this sort of estimate is not quite just. Bishop Pakenham Walsh for instance writes: "I hold that there are cases where servants of God, even though strong in faith, are called upon to continue bearing sickness and pain." And Mr. Pridie asks: "may it not be that some elect souls are called to the honour of sharing with him (i.e. Christ) in the gaining of a victory over disease and pain as well as sharing in the fruits of it?" Similar statements are made by other apologists. But here once more the spiritual healer seems to expect to be able to have it both ways. It will not do, however, to say that sickness is a rebel and a foe and that spiritual healing is God's method for its overthrow; and then, when spiritual healing fails, to say that it is a blessing and a privilege.

IV.

Let it be assumed however that there is nothing of any consequence in the criticisms or questions contained in the foregoing paragraphs. Let it be assumed that on all these points the spiritual healer is in the right. There still remain questions as to the particular method by which he contends that the sick are to be made whole.

What precisely is spiritual healing and how precisely is it to be differentiated from other methods which seem to be akin to it? Bishop Pakenham Walsh's definition is as follows: "There are three types or planes of healing, the one connected

especially with physical science and operating predominantly in the sphere of the body, the second connected with psychology and operating predominantly in the sphere of the mind, the third connected with religion and operating predominantly in the sphere of the spirit. To the first category belongs surgery and medicine; to the second suggestion, psycho-therapeutics and much that goes by the name of faith healing; to the third, healing through faith in God revealed in Jesus Christ, received in answer to prayer with or without such visible signs as the laying on of hands, unction, or Holy Communion." The Bishop adds that these distinctions are not to be taken too rigidly and that the three methods may run into one another or overlap.

The essential thing to be noticed is that spiritual healing is that mode or method which addresses itself to what in the ordinary language of religion is called the soul. The medical man, to speak generally, heals, or tries to heal, the body by what we may call the direct method; the psycho-therapeutist influences or tries to influence it meditately, through appeals by suggestion or kindred methods, to that part of our nature which we describe as mental; and the spiritual healer whilst also seeking to reach the body meditately or indirectly aims a religious shaft at the religious side that it may penetrate the body through the soul.

That as a rough description of the nature and main principles of spiritual healing would probably be allowed to pass. Soul and body are in intimate correspondence; and the soul or spirit is to be so purified and strengthened that the body may share in the new and blessed life which has come to enrich the soul. This is a conception which commands our respect, but it suggests some reflections which are serious.

One such reflection is that the mode of healing thus described, it is hoped not unfaithfully, does not fit in with those instances of healing in the New Testament or in later Christian history to which the spiritual healer appeals as vindicating his position.

Sometimes as we know spiritual miracles are wrought in an instant. Conversions may take place in a place of time no longer than a lightning flash. A man may be brought out of darkness into God's marvellous light, the assurance of forgiveness and the falling of the great peace may come upon the soul, in a shorter time than it takes to record it; but normally it is otherwise. Normally, God appears to work upon the soul as he does for the most part in nature, by methods which are gradual. Spiritual deliverance and spiritual strength do not usually burst upon the soul as a divine surprise. They come after effort and struggle and are an affair of slow, patient, and resolute growth. Most spiritual healers I believe do not expect that the method which they follow should do its work upon the soul and, through the soul upon the body, all at once. It involves a process in which stages have to be gone through and only by degrees is the soul drawn into such union with its Lord that he becomes the life and master of man both in soul and body.

Now I would say quite confidently that nothing approaching what is thus required on the principles of spiritual healing is contemplated in the instances either in the New Testament, or out of it, to which the healers point so triumphantly. There is no suggestion whatever that the cure of the woman who had the spirit of infirmity eighteen years, or of the man at the Pool of Bethesda, or of Simon's wife's mother, or of any other sufferer of whom the New Testament tells, came about as the consequence of inward and spiritual renewal, gradual or, for the matter of that, sudden either. In the case of the man sick of the palsy we are certainly told that the message of absolution was first pronounced over him and that then he was healed. But it is mere arbitrary exegesis in defence of a particular theory and it is an illustration of the fallacy of *post hoc ergo propter hoc* to say that it was his spiritual release that gave back vitality to his inert body.

It is necessary to lay stress on this. Dr. Harris, like many another writer, is at pains to shew that in the primitive Christian services and in those of later times, the spiritual condition of

the sufferer comes in for attention and consideration, and that prayer is made that spiritual blessing and spiritual health may come to him. Undoubtedly it is so. But from his stand-point the language of these services is entirely irrelevant and it is extraordinary that he does not see it. The association of ideas between physical disease and spiritual weakness is so obvious and the one suggests the other so immediately that it was practically impossible that a service, drawn up in order to seek for the healing of a man's body, should not have regard also to his soul and pray for its salvation. But there is no suggestion that the healing of the body was to be the result of renewal of the spiritual life and, when any part of the case for spiritual healing is built upon the assumption that it was, the builders can only be asked whether here, and elsewhere also, they are not building upon the sand.

V.

On the subject of having recourse to medical aid and medical skill, spiritual healers are not of one mind, some holding that it is right to take advantage of the knowledge and experience of the doctor, others—a minority probably—holding that the “spiritual” system of healing should stand on its own feet, unsupported by any extraneous aid.

If principles are to be faithfully applied, it is this minority which would seem to have reason on its side. If it is granted that the Christian method, the true method, of approach to the body and its sicknesses is through the soul, it does not seem to be consistent with that principle to reach the body by a short cut and to treat diseases by methods which do not profess to be concerned with the soul primarily, if at all. In any case it is not easy to see how both views can be right, or how the question can be considered as slight or unimportant.

The same may be said of the two attitudes which are open to the healer with reference to mental and psychic healing. Here again it is probably safe to say the balance of opinion among spiritual healers is decisively in favour of pressing into

the service of their system all the aid and all the light which comes from this side. But the detached observer finds himself a good deal puzzled by the position in which spiritual healing places itself through the free use of these aids to health. The case of Dr. Harris may serve as an example.

Dr. Harris, as will have been gathered from the allusions already made to him, is a declared and whole-hearted believer in spiritual healing. He combines with that belief the opinion that it is the duty of the healer to lay under contribution the arts of the doctor, of the psychologist, and of the psycho-therapeutist and to use to the utmost all the help that they can give. That help is so great, and the effect of it so important, in cases of disease and sickness, that one asks oneself whether, when these deductions have been made the margin left for the spiritual healer to deal with is not rather a small one. Here once more the healer seems to want to have it both ways. But it is not fair, and he cannot be allowed to approach cases of sickness with help borrowed from doctors and psychologists and then, when the patient is cured, to turn round upon us and say "Behold what wonders can be wrought by spiritual healing."

Of course the reminder will be given here of the distinction between spiritual and every other form of healing, as it is defined by Mr. Hickson and other spiritual healers. It is admitted that other systems and other methods can claim for themselves great successes which cannot be denied to them consistently with any respect for evidence. But we are bidden remember the blessings to the spiritual state and the spiritual life of the patient which result from what Pakenham Walsh has glorified by the title "Divine Healing." As regards physical consequences, he is willing to admit that other healers and other systems have to their credit many and remarkable instances of recovered health. It is admitted further that it does not always happen that the spiritual healer is successful if success is to be measured by visible effects on the condition of the poor body. But in these instances we are to take our eyes and our thoughts away from the condition of the feeble and suffering

flesh and think of the consequences which have followed in another sphere, "The fruits of the spirit, generally an increase of love, devotion, and joy in Christ" the reality of which the Bishop is able to testify in many instances.

It is thus apparently admitted that if we were to confine ourselves entirely to the external and physical side of the question there might not be a great deal to choose between Mr. Hickson and M. Coué, between spiritual healers and psychoanalysts. It is the other element or factor it is urged which is the crucial and vital one.

This is surely mystifying. If the spiritual enrichment which is associated with spiritual healing is its justification and its glory, why should these benefits be confined to the physically sick? Ought not every human soul, whatever the condition of its bodily health, be exhorted to become the humble recipient of this grace? Ought we not one and all to invoke Mr. Hickson's or Dr. Harris' or Bishop Pakenham Walsh's help?

It would hardly be honest if one did not acknowledge at this point that this or something like this appears to be Mr. Hickson's own view of his ministry. I have heard him, at one of his services of healing, invite others besides the sick to receive the imposition of his hands. I have seen at the same service priests of the English Church rise from their places in response to that invitation, and kneel before him that their souls might be blessed if their bodies had no need of blessing. It was to me a somewhat surprising incident and I have sometimes speculated as to the particular theory of grace-through-the-imposition-of-hands which was at the back of the ceremony. It seemed to require some elucidation.

VI.

There are one or two important implications involved in the theory of spiritual healing of which its champions do not seem to be aware.

It is obviously anticipated by them that under normal conditions the treatment of disease by their methods will be

successful. Without this expectation such treatment would cease. They can moreover give many instances of the happy and striking results which have followed, and these instances are quoted not as exceptions but as examples of the way in which the theory actually works. In them we are told to see what the normal consequences should be when spiritual methods are applied, and when the spiritual nature of the patient becomes rightly ordered. When these results do not happen, the situation is felt to be unusual and to require some explanation. One such explanation has already been referred to. The reason why the illness does not give way to the line of spiritual treatment is that the sufferer is being called to the high privilege of sharing in the fellowship of the sufferings of Christ. Another explanation which is sometimes offered is that the treatment fails, from the point of view of physical results, by reason of the spiritual inadequacy not of the patient but of the Christian society. It is the weakness of the Church's faith which delays, or hinders, or prevents the patient's restoration to health. If the spiritual condition both of the individual sufferer and of the whole body of Christ were what it should be, the result would be different.

This postulates the belief in a correspondence between the spiritual and physical condition which is, I think, never expressed in clear and definite terms, but from which no way of escape seems to be open. It is further a belief which experience seems to contradict in the most indubitable way. The theory is that the assimilation by the soul of what spiritual healing offers it will be followed normally by improved health. As a matter of fact robust health and saintly character do not go hand in hand. Physical strength and vigour at their highest are found, times without number, in persons to whom we should never think of referring as examples of what the grace of God may accomplish in a human soul. We hear from time to time of a being described as a "muscular Christian," but all the muscular Christians whom I have ever met have been more remarkable for their muscles than for their Christianity. On the other hand, it is on beds of hopeless weakness and

infirmity that can be seen as near an approach as is possible on earth to the character of Christ. It is simply untrue that vigour of body and greatness of soul are associated together as inevitable or even as habitual companions. It is untrue that the body is a sort of chart on which the spiritual temperature registers itself; and it is to be noticed that the doctrine that it is so is not the doctrine of the New Testament. St. Paul certainly did not hold that the decay of the body was an indication of progressive spiritual feebleness, but taught that though the outward man might decay the inner man might be the scene of a daily renewal. Another apostle in writing to his friend Gaius told him that his hope and prayer for him was that he might be in health and might prosper even as his soul was prospering. That hope and that anxiety would have been both unnecessary and foolish if St. John had believed that physical and spiritual strength went together.

There is another implication somewhat of the same order but much graver. When a doctor prescribes a certain mode of treatment, or when he orders certain drugs and medicines, an inference can be drawn as to the complaint from which the patient is, or is supposed to be, suffering. If measures are taken to reduce the blood-pressure, everyone who knows what is being done concludes that this is because the pressure is too high and that that is the cause of the patient's ill-health. If medicine is given to stimulate the action of the heart, it shews that the action is thought to be too weak. If an antidote to a given poison is administered, it is because that particular poison is thought to have got somehow into the patient's system.

Precisely in the same way when bodily sickness is treated by efforts to increase the spiritual vitality, it can only mean that the vitality is low, and that the low vitality is the cause of the physical trouble. On this theory, the question of the apostles recorded in St. John ix, 2, is a valuable one: "Master, who did sin, this man or his parents, that he was born blind?"

The idea that a man's external circumstances and condition reflect his spiritual state and his standing in God's sight, is an

error that dies hard. During the war, particularly during its darkest days, when the war news consisted of little else than the record of misfortunes and reverses to the allied armies in the field, this country was overrun by religious persons, lay and clerical, who declared that these things were an indication of a deep national sinfulness and of God's thought about us. It was this that was hindering our victory and with the call to repentance there went the assurance that to a penitent nation victory would speedily be given.

It was exactly the doctrine and the teaching which the writer of the book of Job set himself to discredit more than two thousand years ago; and is it not virtually the doctrine to which the preachers of spiritual healing have slipped back? It is true that the doctrine is not plainly and openly propounded; observation and experience, to say nothing of authority which is specifically Christian, are too obviously against it. But what of the theory in which it is involved as a conclusion, although the prophets of spiritual healing are not conscious of it, or being conscious of it, are silent?

VII.

Great stress is naturally laid by the exponents of the theory on the fact that our Lord was so largely occupied during the period of his ministry with the healing of the sick. We can however hardly imagine any human being bearing any moral resemblance to him not acting to the best of his power as our Lord did. Nothing, as has been already said, makes the same direct and instant appeal to the human feelings of pity and sympathy as pain. To love like his the appeal must have been irresistible. But it is surely seriously inaccurate to represent him as having the cure of sickness almost as close to his heart as the rescue from sin. The language used on this subject by spiritual healers suggests that his feelings with regard to the two things were the same, that the two were bracketed together in his mind, and that he was as profoundly and vitally interested in the rescue from the one as from the other. The gospels

make it quite clear that this was by no means the case. The people hailed him with enthusiasm because he made the deaf to hear and the dumb to speak; but he shewed that to him this concentration upon his healing activity was a complete mistake. He decidedly and emphatically did not wish that men should think of him as one who was among them to supply their bodies either with healing or with bread. We find him doing his best to prevent his wonderful works from being known and talked about. He heals the sick, no doubt; we may dare to say that, being what he was, he could hardly help healing them; but there is only one occasion mentioned in all four gospels on which a person who had been healed was told to make public what had happened to him. That happened in a district which lay outside the usual sphere of his ministry. He was not going to preach or teach there and it looks as though he felt that there was no risk of his real work and his real message being rendered ineffective by the popular misconception as to his mission which was doing actual harm, in the places where he worked and talked.

This constitutes a warning which may well be brought to the notice of that ardent band who are preaching the healing of disease as a fundamental purpose of the existence of Christ's church.

VIII.

Are they not in fact doing more than this? The language used and the system applied in spiritual healing seems to go perilously near to making physical health the first and chief concern of the Christian religion. It is all very well for the healer to speak to us of the spiritual aims of his system and of the cure of the body through the strengthening and uplifting of the soul; but he teaches quite unequivocally that the energies of the soul are to be revived and the divine life is to fill it in order that from the soul, as from a purified centre, health may radiate and may pervade the physical system. Religion is thus made what can hardly be otherwise described than as a means to physical health.

But religion may not be used as a means to anything beyond itself, and anyone who does so use it ceases, to that extent, to be religious; just as a man who cultivates honesty as a means, and because it is good policy, ceases to that extent to be honest. For religion is the highest example of those things which are to be desired, followed, and cultivated, for their own sake, and for the sake of nothing which may follow in their train.

Here, it seems to me, we have the ground of chief and heaviest complaint against the system and its apostles. It is probable that these teachers would have hard things to say of a man who became religious for the sake of gaining happiness or escaping misery in another world. Yet they seem to be conscious of no inconsistency when they publish as part of the gospel of Christ that when men are ill they are to turn to religion and to religious practices to save them from their pain.

“Religious practices.” The last sentence applies not indeed to the general conception of religion to which the healers seem to be committed but to the detailed advice which they give, and to the practical measures which they adopt in dealing with the sick. Instances are quoted by them with every sign of satisfaction and approval, of feverish or sleepless patients who have lost their fever or who have gained sleep by means of some devotional exercise, as—e.g.—by the repetition of a psalm, or a hymn, or by some other method of the like order. The list if complete might be a long one, but most people will feel a certain repugnance to the idea of using, for example, the Lord’s Prayer, as a narcotic. Similarly there is a very general instinct which finds itself out of sympathy with the view that a better and higher spiritual life is to be sought and spiritual means used, whilst the eye is fixed all the time upon the happy reactions which may happen to the body. Are we to say that this instinct is at fault?

IX.

The statement frequently made that our Lord instituted a ministry of healing for his church has already been noticed.

The appeal which is made to the inclusion of gifts of healing among the gifts which St. Paul in I Corinthians xii mentions as possessed by the church of his day, must be noticed also. It is argued that inasmuch as this gift was never formally and authoritatively withdrawn, it remains part of the permanent endowment of the church and it is declared (see Mr. Hickson and others, *passim*) that it was only through the church's want of knowledge or want of faith that it ever fell into disuse. But why is not the argument extended to the entire series of gifts referred to by St. Paul in that passage? He speaks there of the gift of tongues as being possessed by some and of the gift of the interpretation of tongues as possessed by others. Mr. Pridie, who has a chapter of some length on these verses, deals with the question in a rather airy manner. "We shall not," he says, "discuss the gift of tongues, partly because it does not come within our scope just now, partly because it seems so little to belong to the redemptive aspect of the church's work, that it rapidly passes out of sight as part of her equipment." As one reads these words, one has a feeling that there may be a third reason for Mr. Pridie's reluctance to discuss the subject, namely, that he is not altogether easy in his mind about it. That however is by the way.

Let us look at it from another point of view. If the ministry of spiritual healing formed a recognised part of the church's equipment in New Testament times, and if its principle was an accepted principle, the question presents itself: Why was not the ministry called in, and why was not the principle applied, on certain concrete occasions which have all the air of occasions when the theory would have suggested itself almost spontaneously? Why is Trophimus left at Miletum sick and why is the church there not reproved for leaving him in his sickness when it ought to have been ministering to him out of the resources of healing which were resident within it? Why, if part of the church's commission was to heal the sick, did not St. Paul himself take advantage of it, in the days before the truth about his "stake in the flesh" was revealed to him? Why is Timothy advised to drink a little wine instead of being

reminded that the exercise of the gift of healing belonged to the essential function of the church, and that he need only have recourse to it? Why, in all the prayers and doxologies which burst from St. Paul in his epistles, is there never any thanksgiving for this wonderful gift? Is the answer to all these questions the simple one that the church did not hold the theory attributed to it?

X.

“Live dangerously” is a maxim often heard from the Christian pulpit to-day. It is impressed upon us that the Christian life is one of adventure; and how many times have we not been told that “safety first” is no motto for those who would be numbered with the saints? In using language of this type, the Christian preacher can feel that he has the support of the conscience of almost all mankind. Courage, enterprise, willingness to take risks, and to make sacrifices and to suffer losses, and to face suffering, have been reckoned nearly everywhere and by nearly everyone, as elements in the character of the men who have the largest claim on our thanks and on our admiration.

There may have been times and places in which one aspect of this ideal was too much pressed. The endurance of a hardness which was gratuitous and self-inflicted may have been raised to a place in the scale of ethical values to which it had no right. In other words it is a thing which can be pushed to extreme lengths.

But when extremes and extravagances have been recognised and put aside, has the general conscience and instinct of the world been wrong? There are many ills that flesh is heir to, but is there not something to be said for the belief that to meet them and to make them friends and servants of our souls is better than to evade them?

A Christian is not called upon to be either a Stoic in theory or a fool in practice, or to pretend that he enjoys being ill or

being in pain. But does not the doctrine of the mean apply here, and if monks and hermits sometimes missed the mean by swerving to one side, are not our spiritual healers in danger of missing it by swerving to the other? Is it the case that the first of Christian duties, when pain or sickness comes, is to escape from it?

XI.

Two remarks may be made by way of summary and conclusion.

1. Whilst it is a matter of Christian duty to resist the suggestion that at the back and at the root of all disease there is spiritual unfaithfulness in some form, it is unquestionably true that it is in a disordered spiritual nature that many of the physical troubles from which men suffer, especially perhaps in the present age, have their origin.

The soul needs care and food and discipline, and when these spiritual needs, together with the soul itself, are overlooked, they have a way of calling attention to themselves. Sometimes they recall to us the fact of their existence by inflicting upon us mental discomfort and uneasiness; sometimes, particularly if the neglect of them has been gross and daring, they proclaim themselves by the revenges which they take upon the body. There have been days when medical diagnosis and medical treatment have been carried on as though the spiritual factor in our nature did not count. Spiritual healers assert that this factor does count and counts for very much. In doing this they have rendered us a valuable and important service. But a truth may be pressed too far.

The human mind is always seeking for a formula or a law under which the facts or the phenomena with which it has to deal may be brought. It is a noble search; but it has happened before now that the seekers have been wrong in supposing that they have reached the formula and have found the law which they were seeking. The spiritual healer in his application of a spiritual remedy to every disorder of the flesh seems to be an instance in point.

2. The true regulation and orientation of the forces of our spiritual nature, the setting of the affection on things above is a thing to be desired more than any other thing in life. But it is to be desired and cultivated for its own sake, and quite independently of any advantage to our bodies or to our bodily health which might be found to follow from it. The obligation to live the highest life possible to us would be the same, if it should lead us neither to better health here, nor to heaven hereafter; and the duty of "following the gleam" ought not to be reinforced by appeals to any indirect result however happy or however certain.

It has been said that all our moral mistakes consist either in turning into ends what ought to be used as means, or in converting into means what are intended to be pursued as ends. The spiritual healer, it is beyond all doubt, has been a helper of many who were suffering in body but even bodily relief may be purchased at too great a cost; and the question is whether the cost is not too great when it takes the form of inverting the order of first and second things and of putting first things into the second place and second things into the first.

DOUGLAS McLAREN.

NOTE.—This article was written and had left the writer's hands before the death of Mr. Hickson in November last. Had it been produced after, instead of before, his death, some of the phrases employed would have been slightly altered and, in others, a change of tense would have been made. Since, however, it is his teaching and his theory which are here under consideration, and not his person; and since neither teaching nor theory is affected by his death, the essay is here printed exactly as it was written.

D. McL.

ART. II.—THE KING OF TYRE.

EZEKIEL in chapter xxviii, 1-10, decrees the doom of the prince (*nagid*) of Tyre; in the following section, 11-19, he laments the fall of the king (*melek*) of Tyre. The variation of title does not in itself warrant assumption that the prophet has separate conceptions in mind, and commentators as a rule agree with Davidson that the terms are used indifferently,¹ so that "prince" and "king" are one. Yet, as Fairbairn observes, the second passage "is cast in an entirely different mould" from the first;² and Skinner says, "The point of view is very different in these two sections. In the first the prince is still conceived as a man . . . In the second, however, the king appears as an angelic being . . . It almost seems as if the prophet had in his mind the idea of a tutelary spirit or genius of Tyre."³ Such a distinction, if there, is scarcely casual; and, in fact, the prophet's words reveal the two characters as separated by all the width that divides the natural from the supernatural.

The prince is thus dealt with: "Thou hast said, I am a god . . . yet thou art man, and not God . . . Wilt thou yet say before him that slayeth thee, I am God? but thou art man, and not God, in the hand of him that woundeth thee. Thou shalt die the deaths of the uncircumcised." The king is told: "Thou wast in Eden the garden of God . . . Thou art the anointed cherub that covereth . . . Thou wast blameless in thy ways from the day thou wast created, till unrighteous-

¹ Davidson and Streane, *Cambridge Bible*, 224. "The prophet now turns to the ruler of Tyre called 'prince' in v. 2 and 'king' in v. 12."—Redpath, *Westminster Comm.*, 149. So also in treatment, Toy, *Polychrome Bible*; Lofthouse, *Century Bible*.

² *Ezekiel*, 260. So entirely different, in fact, that it has been popularly understood of Satan.

³ *Expositor's Bible*, 252-3.

ness was found in thee . . . I will destroy thee, O covering cherub . . . Thou hast profaned thy sanctuaries; therefore will I bring forth fire from thy midst."

To assume identity in the subjects of these two oracles is, on the face of it, to risk missing the prophet's intention: the prince appears as an arrogant mortal, the king as a super-human being of pristine perfection, whose fault is not in what he claims to be, but in what he no longer is; the prince is "above himself," the king is fallen. And to say that the mortal ruler "tends more and more" to merge into the idea of the personified city¹ does less than justice to the prophet's arrangement of the oracles, which are separated by their introductions as distinctly as by their outlook. As their terms stand, the first "word of the Lord" deals, fully and finally, with the ruler of Tyre, the throne; the second looks beyond flesh and blood to the spirit or angel of Tyre — the Michael or St. George of the old world's island-queen.

The language of the second section, so apparently hyperbolic, is sometimes explained as ironical,² a continuation of the sarcasm discovered in the first section, "Thou art wiser than Daniel; there is no secret that they can hide from thee." But irony need not be suspected in such address to the representative of the Phoenicians, navigators of the world and garnerers of its wisdom, excelling in science and every practical art: according to Josephus "wiser than Solomon" would have been no sarcasm,³ while the Phoenicians earned the reputation of masters of invention by appropriating and developing every discovery they came across. And even as irony the terms used of the king are extravagant: what should constrain the prophet to fling about in mockery such expressions as "garden of God," "anointed cherub," "blameless from the

¹ Davidson, *op. cit.*, 227. Cp. M'Fadyen, Peake's *Comm.*, 514.

² Skinner, 257; Fairbairn, 260. "The whole passage of course is biting sarcasm." — Redpath, 151.

³ King Hiram solved Solomon's riddles by means of Abdemon, a youth of Tyre, while Solomon failed with Hiram's riddles. — *Ant.*, viii, 5, 3; *C. Ap.*, i, 17 and 18.

day thou wast created"? When the most precise and world-wise of Hebrew seers announces the annihilation of a power which had been compeer with Egypt and would yet challenge Rome, which had leagued with David and linked Jerusalem to farthest lands, exaggeration or sarcasm is scarce to be thought of; here was a theme where the facts needed no bush, which words could hardly contain. Further, there is an obvious aspect in which the apparent irony becomes salient fact: Phœnicia as the buffer-state between Israel and the overseas world had in truth been an anointed and covering cherub—a providential protector. Suspicion of an exercise in sarcasm at the expense of Ethbaal II must defer to an attempt to find the prophet addressing the genius of Tyre in sincerity.

There is plain reason for his reserving the name of "king" for the second oracle: the patron deity of Tyre was Melcarth or Melkart, *melek kart*, "king of the city." It is strange that Ezekiel's commentators have not in the "king of Tyre" hailed the "king of the city, lord of Tyre,"¹ but the prophet to a degree doomed himself to be misunderstood. "Nothing thou for ever!" was his final word to the king, and so utterly nothing did Melkart become that not merely his importance, but even his existence, could be overlooked by Old Testament scholars. Yet his importance was such that at one end of his career the wanderings of his votaries over the Mediterranean are considered to have originated the tradition of the labours of Hercules,² with whom the Greeks identified

¹ Conder, *Heth and Moab*, 96, observes that Ezek. xxviii, 12, "seems perhaps to refer to Melkarth" rather "than to any mortal monarch."

² "Through the whole of Asia, in Egypt and Libya, in all the countries known to the Greeks, from Gades as far as to Scythia, people could tell of him (Hercules) and his deeds. In him there was a Theban, or Attic, or Aetolian hero, with local colouring, and historical features supplied by the fortunes of his race, mixed up with the wandering god of the sun, Melkarth, to whom the Phoenicians had erected temples in all their settlements on the Mediterranean."—Döllinger, *Gentile and Jew* (1906), I, 114. From the Phoenician cult "the legend of the voyages of Hercules . . . may be supposed to have originated"—Frazer, *Golden*

him, and at the other he inspired the march of Hannibal on Rome.

In the ashes of Melkart may yet be read his former greatness. A bilingual inscription from Malta¹ agrees with Philo of Byblus² in equating him to Hercules. Herodotus³ in the fifth century B.C. journeyed to Tyre and Thasos specially to investigate his antecedents, concluded that he had been worshipped fourteen centuries before the Greek hero was born, and commended the maintenance of distinction between the ancient god and the hero. Arrian⁴ says the temple at Tyre was the oldest known to history. Plutarch mentions that Theseus, founder of Athens, abolished the Isthmian rites of Melicertes—that is, Melkart—as being rather nocturnal mysteries than a public spectacle.⁵ The Pillars of Hercules were named from the Tyrian god, and the famous neighbouring temple at Gades was Melkart's.⁶ The husband of Dido, foundress of Carthage, was priest of Melkart at Tyre, “a

¹ Cooke, *N.-Semitic Inscriptions*, 102; Kenrick, *Phoenicia*, 172. On two miniature pillars dedicated by Abd-Osiris and Osiri-Shamar, 2nd cent. B.C.

² “Μέλκαθρος.”—In Eusebius, *Praep. Evang.*, i, 10, 27; trans. in Rawlinson, *Phoenicia*, 338-347.

³ ii, 44 and 145.

⁴ *Anab.*, ii, 16.

⁵ *Theseus*, 25; A. B. Cook, *Zeus*, II, 1109. Melicertes and his mother Ino or Leucothea were beneficent sea-deities.—Apolldorus, iii, 4. 3; Ovid, *Fasti*, vi, 413 ff.; Milton, *Comus*, 875-6. The grandsires of Melicertes were Aeolus and Cadmus—the wind and Tyre.

⁶ Strabo, iii, 5, 5; Arrian, *ib.*; Appian, *Hisp.*, 2; Justin, xliv, 5.

Bough : *Adonis* (1907), 90; and the number of his labours, twelve, from “the contests of the Phoenician god Melkart with the twelve hostile beasts of the Zodiac”—Harper's *Dict. of Class. Lit. and Ant.*, 790b. Thebes, the home of Hercules, was the meeting-point of Aryan and Semite in Greek tradition; and in Homer Hercules appears as an enemy to Greece and its gods—*Il.*, v, 392-404; xi, 689-90; *Od.*, xxi, 28. Melkart's name, **מלקרת**, read

Greek fashion left-right, differs in only one letter from **HPKLM**, (H)ER(A)KL(E)M.

dignity next to that of the king.”¹ Melkart was tutelar god of Carthage,² the “new *kart*,” as of the mother-city; the Carthaginians regularly sent envoys to his festival at Tyre,³ and in their early days allotted him there the tenth of their revenues.⁴ On his altar the child Hannibal, son of Hamilcar, “he whom Melkart protects,” swore lifelong hatred to the Romans, and in his shrine at Gades the Punic leader renewed the vow immediately before marching to Italy;⁵ if Hannibal’s venture had been a shade more successful, Melkart must have challenged Jupiter’s place in the esteem and the annals of the world.

Impression from what can be learnt of Melkart’s cult is favourable. Whatever the isolated barbarities,⁶ to identify him with the notorious child-devouring Moloch of Carthage⁷ is an evident confusion; neither is there warrant for regarding

¹ Justin, xviii, 4.

² Diodorus, xx, 14. Carthago was reputed the daughter of the Tyrian Hercules.—Cicero, *Nat. Deor.*, iii, 16.

³ Arrian, *Anab.*, ii, 24; cp. Curtius, iv, 8.

⁴ Diodorus, *ib.*; Justin, xviii, 7.

⁵ Martial, ix, 43; Livy, xxi, 21; cp. 1, and Nepos, *Hann.*, 2.

⁶ Lycophron, *Alex.*, 229, states that at Tenedos infants were sacrificed to Palaemon—alias Melicertes. On the other hand Macrobius, i, 7, 31, relates that Hercules taught the Pelasgi to offer to Saturn lighted tapers ($\phi\omega\varsigma$) instead of human victims ($\phi\omega\varsigma$); cp. Arnobius, *Adv. Gentes*, ii, 68.

⁷ So Selden, *De Dis Syriis* (1680), 109, following Pliny, *H.N.*, xxxvi, 5 (6); but the Sicilian Diodorus, *l.c.*, calls this deity Kronos immediately after mentioning Hercules of Tyre; Curtius, iv, 15, likewise in one context distinguishes the latter from the Phoenician monster Saturn; and so Eusebius, *De Laud. Const.*, 13, of the Phoenicians’ Melkatharos and their Kronos. The Carthaginian Moloch is called Kronos or Saturn also in Platonic *Minos*, 5; Demon (c. 300 B.C.), *Frag. Hist. Gr.*, I, 380, Müller; Plutarch, *De Superstит.*, 13; Minucius, *Octavius*, 30; Tertullian, *Apol.*, 9; Porphyry, *De Abstin.*, ii, 56. Philo of Byblus, *op. cit.*, i, 10, 16-34, makes Melkart son of Zeus Demarous, who was son of Uranus; while Kronos or El, at whose cruel disposition “all the gods were astounded,” was son of Uranus and Ge.

him as the Baal of Jezebel and Athaliah.¹ The historian of Carthage is moved to remark that there his worship “seems to have been so much more genial and so much more spiritual than the rest, that we are fain to dwell upon it as a foil to what has preceded . . . Melcarth had not even a temple. The whole city was his temple, and he refused to be localised in any particular part of it. He received, there is reason to believe, no sacrifices of blood; and it was his comparatively pure and spiritual worship which, as we see repeatedly in Carthaginian history, formed a chief link in the chain that bound the parent to the various daughter-cities.”² In his temple at Gades, founded about 1100 B.C., there was no image, and his symbol was an ever-burning fire:

“*Irrestincta focus servant altaria flammae.*
Sed nulla effigies, simulacrae nota deorum.
Maiestate locum et sacro implevere timore.”

In the further description of the same Spanish poet³ “the exclusion of women from the sacerdotal function, the abhorrence of swine, the garments of white linen, and the shaven heads of the priests, indicate affinity to the Jewish and Egyptian rites.”⁴ There appears likewise to have been no image in his other temples. Herodotus speaks only of two

¹ Tyre had its pantheon—its Baal-shamen or Zeus (Jos., *C. Ap.*, i, 17 and 18) mentioned with two other Baals and Melkart in Esarhaddon’s treaty with Tyre; cp. “the gods in Tyre” in Diodorus, *l.c.*, and the Carthaginian pantheon in Polybius, vii, 9. Jezebel’s regicide father was Ethbaal I, “Baal’s man” and priest of Baal’s consort, Ashtoreth (Jos., *C. Ap.*, i, 18), while the priest of Melkart was second to the dynast (Justin, *supra*). According to Josephus, who previously mentions Hercules of Tyre, the Baal of Jezebel was Belus (*Ant.*, viii, 13, 1; cp. ix, 6, 6), a name representative of Jezebel’s line (Virgil, *Aen.*, i, 621), and equated by Philo (*l.c.*, 26), and Greeks generally, to Zeus. Ezekiel possibly addresses Melkart as “king” instead of “baal” of Tyre as the lesser evil of two ambiguities.

² Bosworth Smith, *Carthage and the Carthaginians*, 34.

³ Silius Italicus (1st cent. A.D.), iii, 14-32. Cp. Is. ii, 16, “ships of Tarshish” associated with “desirable imagery.”

⁴ Kenrick, *Phoenicia*, 322-3; cp. Herodotus, ii, 35-37, 47.

pillars at Tyre, with which authorities compare the Jachin and Boaz of Solomon's temple;¹ Ezekiel calls them "the pillars of thy (Tyre's) strength" (xxvi, 11), as who should say "the ark of thy strength"; according to Philo they represented *pyr* and *pneuma*,² Fire and Breath—Fire presumably as the principle of the cosmos from which all is formed and into which all will be resolved, Breath as the actuating or vital principle;³ Herodotus says that one pillar was of refined gold, while the other shone brilliantly by night—so corresponding respectively to the purifying element and the vital.

This noctilucent, or persistence through darkness, was characteristic of Melkart, the god of the first night-sailors. It emerges also in his ever-burning fire, in his nocturnal Isthmian rites, in the rôle of Melicertes as patron of mariners.⁴ The Tyrian Hercules was entitled Astrochiton, "Star-clad," "because night's starry tunics (*chitones*) shine over the firmament;"⁵ he was born of Zeus Demarous and Asteria—of the heavenly "sower" and the stars.⁶ Altogether he appears as a spirit of fire or light, particularly revered in his power to

¹ Skinner, *Kings*, 125; Benzinger, *Encyc. Biblica*, IV, 4933. In Ezekiel's temple also "there were pillars by the posts," xl, 49.

² *op. cit.*, i, 10, 10.

³ The Stoics, following Heraclitus, regarded the cosmos as being in its fundamental nature fire, or more specially "fiery vapour (*pneuma*) in continual movement, blowing as it were in currents through space."—Adamson, *Development of Greek Philosophy*, 46, 266 ff. Cp. Plato's conception of a pillar of light spanning the universe, *Repub.*, 616 B; and see Gen. i, 2-3; Ezek. i, 4; xxxvii, 9; Ps. civ, 4, and Heb. i, 7; Acts ii, 2-4.

⁴ "If a ploughman ignorant of Lucifer should demand a ship, Melicerta would cry out."—Persius, v, 102-3.

⁵ Nonnus, *Dionys.*, xl, 408-9. Cp. Hercules in Homeric *Od.*, xi, 606 ff., "like black Night . . . And about his breast was an awful belt, a baldrick of gold, whereon wondrous things were wrought."

⁶ Philo, *l.c.*; Eudoxus (4th cent. B.C.) in Athenaeus, ix, 47; Cicero, *Nat. Deor.*, iii, 16. Demarous from *aroun*, "to sow," as *demarchos*, *demiourgos*; Asteria from *aster*, "star," Callimachus, iv, 36-38.

survive and overcome eclipse—the harvest of light from the seed of the stars. “Star-clad Herakles, lord of fire, file-leader of the cosmos, Sun,” a late Egyptian poet¹ addresses the patron of Tyre; and one is reminded of the “shining one, son of the morning” who once was king in Babylon (Is. xiv, 12).

That in some degree Melkart was represented in the sun, the supreme light, is apparent: he died in the west;² Gades at the world’s extreme owed its sanctity to his reputed burial there,³ and there too his death appears to have been annually celebrated by burning a gigantic effigy at the water’s edge;⁴ while at Tyre, the mother-city in the east, his *egersis* or “resurrection” was solemnised.⁵ But equally he had his noctilucent aspect; and that it was the resurrection of the year, of the powers of light and life, rather than of the orb of day, which was celebrated at Tyre, is indicated both by the dating of the festival to February (Peritius) “when the season liveth” (Gen. xviii, 10), and by the association of the god’s revival, after Typhon’s death-stroke, with a harbinger of spring, the quail.⁶

¹ Nonnus (4th cent. A.D.), *ib.*, 369-70.

² In Spain.—Sallust, *Jug.*, 18; Arnobius, *Adv. Gentes*, i, 36.

³ Mela, iii, 6. Cp. “from Gades even to the Dawn,” and “the sun hissing in the Herculean pool,” Juvenal, x, 1-2; xiv, 280. Strabo, iii, 2, 12, derives Homer’s Tartarus from Tartessus.

⁴ Pausanias, x, 4, 6. Frazer, *Adonis*, ch. v, suggests that Melkart’s resurrection followed the burning of his effigy both at Tyre and its colonies. A. B. Cook, *Zeus*, I, 601, questions. Evidence for the burning of Melkart, at least at Gades, is—(a) Pausanias associates the ceremony there with a command of Hercules; (b) Ezekiel condemns the king of Tyre to be brought to ashes in his own fire; (c) the Greek Hercules traditionally died on a pyre.

⁵ “Πρῶτος τε τὸν Ἡρακλέους ἔγερσιν ἐποιήσατο ἐν τῷ Περιτίῳ μηνί.”—Menander in *Jos., Ant.*, viii, 5, 3. So “resurrection” in Mt. xxvii, 53.

⁶ “The Phoenicians sacrifice quails to Hercules, because Hercules the son of Asteria and Zeus, when on his way towards Libya, was slain by Typhon, but when Iolaus fetched a quail and held it towards him, he smelt it and returned to life.”—Eudoxus, *l.c.* In Greek mythology Asteria became a quail (*ortyx*), then the island of Asteria, Ortygia, or Delos, where the sun-god Phoebus was born.—Apollodorus, i, 4, 1.

It is within the limits of evidence, therefore, to regard Melkart as a lord of light and life who died and rose renewed. In essence, and indeed in name, he was a phœnix-god.¹ As spirit of the starry seed, surviving the attack of Typhon and triumphing over the powers of darkness, he links with Osiris; as *pneuma*, with Ezekiel's conception of resurrection by wind or breath (xxxvii, 1-14) and with Isaiah's by "dew of light" (xxvi, 19). "A duplicate of Osiris Adonis," one authority terms him, another "a local Adonis."² In Cyprus he was united with Eshmun of Zidon, equivalent of Adonis at Byblus.³ His Osiris character has left evident traces in his Greek counterpart, begotten by Zeus "to be a warder-off of destruction":⁴ Homer and Hesiod between them preserve the tradition that Alcmene's son overcame the offspring of Typhon at the gate of Hades;⁵ the hero's mastering of Death is reprobated in Homer and Pindar, utilised in Euripides;⁶ while Theseus as well as Alcestis was raised by his mighty hand "safe from the dead to the light of life."⁷ The Carthaginians associated with Melkart in their pantheon Iolaus, the assistant of his resurrection,⁸ himself famed for renewing his youth

¹ It is scarcely coincidence that the Greeks had the same word, *phoinix*, for Phoenician and phoenix. Melkart was resurrected "lord of fire," and in Egyptian symbolism the phoenix was born from fire.—Budge, *Gods of Egyptians*, II, 371; cp. Martial, v, 7; Maundeville, ch. v. In Homer *Phoinix* means "Tyrrian" as distinguished from "Zidonian."—Leaf, *Companion to Iliad*, on vi, 289; xxiii, 743.

² Döllinger, *op. cit.*, I, 183; Conder, *op. cit.*, 97.

³ *Corp. Inscript. Semit.*, I, 16b; S. A. Cook, *Religion of Ancient Palestine* (1930), 161.

⁴ Hesiod, *Shield of Herakles*, 29.

⁵ *Il.*, viii, 366-9; *Od.*, xi, 623-5; *Theog.*, 306-11; 768-74.

⁶ *Il.*, v, 395-401; *Olymp.*, ix, 33-41; *Alcestis*, 1139-42. Also Apollodorus, i, 9, 15; ii, 7, 3.

⁷ Euripides, *Her. Furens*, 619-21, 1222; Apollodorus, ii, 5, 12.

⁸ "Ἐναντίον δαίμονος Καρχηδονίων καὶ Ἡρακλέους καὶ Ἰολάου."—Polybius, vii, 9; Eudoxus, *supra*.

under the starry influence of Hercules.¹ Mohammedans call the god's successor at Tyre "the prophet beloved of women"²—the character attributed to Adonis as "the desire of women" in Dan. xi, 37.

In the light that Ezekiel was lamenting the downfall of the principal embodiment of the dying and resurrected god within the bounds of Palestine, one glimpses the importance of the occasion, recognises a unique theme worthy of the unique dirge. The Old Testament is singularly reticent on that cult: Osiris, the universal god of Egypt, is not so much as hinted at, though Moses was by Egyptian tradition his priest,³ and the tribes of Ephraim and Manasseh reckoned descent from a priest's daughter of Heliopolis; the name of Adonis is avoided, and allusions to his cult are of the briefest; Melkart's existence has not from the Old Testament been suspected. Such reticence, contrasted with the Hebrew attitude to the Baalim and Ashtaroth, or deities of forces, implies toleration and suggests sympathy; but of that sympathy, with its import of Old Testament recognition that "the life was the light of men, and the light shineth in darkness," there is no overt expression, if not in this farewell address to the king of Tyre.

That Melkart might stand forth as representative of his kin, not only from his sharing house-room with Jehovah, but also from his pre-eminence in the world at large, is evident from the above survey. If his name has not lived as those of Adonis and Osiris, it was because his own greatness brought upon him the vengeful obliteration of Greeks and Romans. Adonis had practically a local cult, and neither Tammuz nor Osiris spread their shrines over the known world as Melkart did, nor found

¹ Euripides, *Heracleidae*, 849-58; Ovid, *Met.*, ix, 397-401. Iolaus was charioteer of the Greek Hercules.—Hesiod, *Shield*; cp. Pindar, *Isthm.*, i, 16 *ff.*

² Conder, *op. cit.*, 300: "a modern representative of the Tyrian Hercules"—who was irresistibly attractive to women, *ib.*, 91.

³ Manetho in Jos., *C. Ap.*, i, 26.

strength to challenge Olympus; but twice after Ezekiel's day—in Alexander's time and in Hannibal's—history's issues hung on the struggle between Hercules of Tyre and Hercules of Thebes, and on both occasions the European came near defeat. It is mere justice to allow to Ezekiel understanding of the god's potentialities. At the lowest he must be read as lamenting a mighty spirit brooding over the Mediterranean from the beginning of history, a concept of triumphant life intrinsically not unworthy to stand on holy ground; and full value must be given every word which tends to lift the veil that hides from readers of the Hebrew Scriptures their attitude to the faith which flourished before Abraham was, which carved the dawn-expectant Sphinx, and placed symbolic wheat in tombs, and embalmed the body of Israel in the land of the phœnix.

“*Moreover the word of Jehovah came to me, saying, Son of man, take up a lamentation for the king of Tyre, and say to him, Thus saith Adonai Jehovah:*

Thou sealest up the measure . . .” The oracle leads off from Melkart's distinctive status as the god at Canaan's threshold. The term “measure” (*toknith*, “pattern”) is used elsewhere only of the temple-plan in Ezek. xlivi, 10; here it correspondingly denotes the land-plan. In the ideal land of Ezek. xlviii the north boundary is immediately south of Beirut,¹ that is, at the marches of Tyre and Gebal. In practice the Phoenician hold on the Lebanon had always sealed—closed or fastened up—Israel's sphere; so that the essence of Melkart's relation to Jehovah's land lay in his domain rounding off “the land which is the glory of all lands.” It is in keeping with our prophet's concentration on the land that this point comes first.

“. . . full of wisdom, and perfect in beauty.” The wisdom and beauty of Tyre have been unreservedly acknowledged (xxviii, 5; xxvii, 4), and irony is no more to be found here in their attribution to a cult which on the one hand was the wisdom of the Egyptians, and on the other gave the world

¹ See *Church Quarterly Review*, April, 1933, 18, note 3.

a synonym for beauty in Adonis. The words are endorsement of a concept which was loftier wisdom and beauty than the world of to-day can rise to—that the way of the seed is the way of life. No contradiction is involved in the prophet abhorring contemporary Tammuz-rites (viii, 14), as in this oracle he anathematises Melkart, yet seeing innate wisdom and beauty in resurrection-faith: it was a case of *corruptio optimi pessima*.

“*Thou wast in Eden the garden of God.*” Melkart represented a revival-faith old as the primeval garden¹—the faith on which the first gardener acted; and in Ezekiel’s eyes he represented it in its birthplace, for to the prophet the Lebanon was Eden the garden of God² (xxxi, 3, 8, 9, 16). In Gentile regard the Lebanon was peculiarly the land of renaissance, scene of the resurrection of Osiris-Adonis; while a kindred Hebrew outlook upon it is reflected in the “dew of Hermon” which was “life for evermore” to Zion (Ps. cxxxiii, 3), in the aroma of Lebanon surrounding the Shulammite whose soul was transported by the advent of spring (Song iv, 11; vi, 11-12), in Isaiah’s linking of the land’s enlarged borders with his resurrection-faith (xxvi, 13-19). If this reputation was seed from Eden, Melkart, as presiding embodiment of Lebanon’s indigenous faith, embodied the faith of Eden.

“*Every precious stone was thy covering, the sardius, the topaz, and the diamond, the beryl, the onyx, and the jasper, the sapphire, the emerald, and the carbuncle, and gold.*” The survey of the king’s privileges passes to the settlement of the tribes in his land. As in Is. xxiii “the burden of Tyre” swells into “commandment concerning Canaan,” so here the

¹ Cp. the Babylonian hymn of the primeval garden: “In the midst of it was the god Tammuz.”—Sayce, *Higher Criticism*, 101.

² A belief not peculiar to himself, however his authority encouraged it: see, e.g., Chaucer, *Monkes Tale* (c. 1390), 17-18; Thompson, *Crusader’s Coast* (1929), 85-86. “The inhabitants of the country stoutly maintain it was the cradle of the human race . . . They point to the village of Edhen as the paradise in which our first parents were placed.”—Stewart, *Tent and Khan*, 505; cp. Am. i, 5.

tutelary spirit of the Phœnician metropolis is treated as the genius of Canaan. The stones listed are nine from the twelve in the high priest's breastplate, where they were engraved each with its tribal name and set in gold (Ex. xxviii, 17-21), the gold naturally from its mention here representing Levi as thirteenth tribe.¹ The three omitted stones (jasper, agate, amethyst) suggest the tribes not settled in Canaan proper—Gad and Reuben beyond Jordan, Simeon beyond Gaza (Gen. x, 19),—though in their participation in national affairs (Dt. xxxiii, 21; I K. viii, 1) entitling the prophet to say “every precious stone.”

“*The workmanship of thy sockets and thy bezels² was in thee; in the day thou wast created they were prepared.*” The comparison is to the breastplate which held the stones, “of gold, of blue, and purple, and scarlet, and fine twined linen” (Ex. xxviii, 15); under the figure of a ship Ezekiel pictures Tyre in comparable terms: “of fine linen was thy banner-sail . . . blue and purple was thine awning . . . very glorious in the heart of the seas” (xxvii). In the prophet's view the glory of Phœnicia was the mounting for the jewels of God, for whom the land of Canaan had been designed from all time; in the entrance of the tribes the empty sockets were filled, and the genius of Phœnicia wore them as the breastplate the stones, protecting and enhancing them. The thought, which at once merges the resurrection-god in the land over which he presided, and regards that land as a setting moulded for “the precious things of heaven,” is paralleled in the independent conviction of a modern observer: “Palestine is one vast tablet whereupon God's messages to man have been drawn, and graven deep . . . God so made this land of Canaan that its physical conformation should furnish appropriate types and emblems . . .

¹ It is in consonance with this interpretation that both gold and Levites, present in Solomon's temple, are absent from Ezekiel's.

² “‘Thy sockets and thy grooves’ (Davidson) or ‘thy settings and thy sockets.’”—Oxford *Lexicon*, 666a. “*Foramina tua.*”—Vulgate.

infolding in itself, and unfolding to the world, the dark mysteries of the life that is, and of that which is to be.”¹

“*Thou art the anointed cherub that covereth; and I set thee: thou wast upon the holy mountain of God; thou hast walked up and down amid the stones of fire.*” Without losing touch with the prior figure, the oracle now presents Melkart as hovering over rather than coalescing with the land, a consecrated guardian spirit or “shadow” (cp. Nu. xiv, 9) appointed when Jehovah “set the bounds of the peoples.” Historically, such had been Phœnicia’s rôle. “The holy mountain of God” is, from Ezek. xx, 40, and xlvi, largely equivalent to “the mountain of the height of Israel,” the central mountain-land of Palestine.² There the representatives of the Tyrian spirit had gone to and fro in “brotherly covenant” with David’s house, and had assisted in building Solomon’s temple. “The stones of fire” are the tribes as living stones reflecting the Shekinah glow in that heyday of national life.

“*Thou wast blameless in thy ways from the day thou wast created, till unrighteousness was found in thee.*” The words stand as an *ex cathedra* pronouncement on the resurrection-god, a Hebrew benediction on the faith in renewal of life which was light shining in a dark place—the faith in all probability of the Canaanite priest of El Elyon, “king of *zedek*,” who was likened to the Son of God.³

“*In the abundance of thy commerce they have filled thy midst with violence, and thou hast missed the way.*” “Thy midst” of a human ruler has caused difficulty, but the

¹ Thomson, *Land and Book*, introd. and ch. xxiii.

² “‘My mountains’—‘my holy mountain,’—are expressions for the whole country.”—Stanley, *Sinai and Palestine*, 130. In Ezek. xlvi the “holy” territory in the centre of Palestine extends 25,000 by 20,000 reeds, or c. 50 by 40 miles. Cp. “all my holy mountain,” Is. xi, 9.

³ Gen. xiv, 18; Ps. cx, 4; Heb. vii, 3. “Eliun, or ‘the Most High,’ ” and “Sydyk, or ‘the Righteous,’ ” occur in the Phoenician pantheon of Philo Byblius, *l.c.*, 13-15. Eliun answers to Adonis.—Meyer, *Enc. Biblica*, I, 70.

expression is natural of Melkart as an unconfined spirit of the Tyrian seas and shores. The accusation of violence comes with special weight against the deity who was converse and foil to the "god of forces"; and it is remarkably borne out in the inaugural sentence of Herodotus' history of the conflict of Greece with Asia—"The Phœnicians began the quarrel . . . on long voyages." That charge is evidently just, inasmuch as they were pioneer slave-dealers, and, as opportunity served, pirates and kidnappers;¹ Pliny states they were "first discoverers of the art of war";² in Ezekiel's time they employed mercenaries from all quarters to protect their trade (xxvii, 10); while Phœnician and brutality became synonymous in Greek vocabulary.³ As soul of such racial praxis Melkart was a lost soul.

"Therefore I will cast thee as profane out of the mountain of God, and I will destroy thee, O covering cherub, from amid the stones of fire." In the sentence on Melkart now commencing, the verbs throughout are in the perfect of threatening, rendered by the future tense in A.V., by the perfect in R.V. The threats certainly carry a doom much more complete than anything that had so far happened (cp. Jl. iii, 5). Destruction "from amid the stones of fire" is the weird, but in Ezekiel's day ten tribes were gone, while Tyre was exulting in the prospect of filling Judah's place (xxvi, 2) and Melkart "sealed the measure"; the outlook is to the renaissance of the tribes, when the earth shall shine with the glory returned to the temple (xliii, 2), but "there shall be no more a Canaanite in the house of the Lord of hosts" (Zech. xiv, 21). "I will set glory in the land of the living . . . and thou (Tyre) shalt be no more" (xxvi, 20-21).

"Thine heart was haughty in thy beauty, thou hast subverted thy wisdom to thy brilliance: I will cast thee to the

¹ Homer, *Od.*, xv, 415 ff. ; Herodotus, i, 1 ; ii, 56 ; Thucydides, i, 8 ; Am. i, 9 ; Ezek. xxvii, 13 ; Jl. iii, 6.

² *H.N.*, v, 13 (12).

³ Liddell and Scott, s.v. Φοινικίζω. Carthaginians were "the most evil and bloody" of barbarians.—Plutarch, *Timoleon*, 20.

ground, I will lay thee before kings that they may gloat¹ on thee." This charge might stand against some "angels of the church" to-day; and its recognition of inherent attractiveness and merit shows the gulf between Melkart and the Baalim in prophetic regard. The weird is seen in proper perspective as issuing from the prophet who foresaw Tyre a bare rock. Though Nebuchadnezzar reduced Tyre about fourteen years after the date of the oracle, he had no cause for gloating (xxix, 18), and the City-King lost little if any of his arrogant splendour, his temple being greatly venerated and richly adorned in the following century, a captured Apollo standing at his foot-stool in the next.² In 333 B.C. Alexander the Great knocked at the gates of Tyre with a claim to worship there his ancestor Hercules, and was refused entry; the historic siege followed, and at the end of eight months the descendant of the Greek hero had his will in the shrine of Melkart. "Alexander," to quote Arrian,³ "then offered sacrifice to Hercules, and conducted a procession in honour of that deity with all his soldiers fully armed. The ships also took part in this religious procession in honour of Hercules. He moreover held a gymnastic contest in the temple, and celebrated a torch race. The military engine, also, with which the wall had been battered down, was brought into the temple and dedicated as a thank-offering; and the Tyrian ship sacred to Hercules, which had been captured in the naval attack, was likewise dedicated to the god." Thenceforth in his "crowning city" Hercules of Tyre was cast to the ground before Hercules of Greece. Antiochus Epiphanes (175-164 B.C.), the vigorous Helleniser of Jewry, attended the festival of Hercules at Tyre (2 Mac. iv, 18-19), and many another Greek king must have feasted his

¹ "'Feast eyes upon,' sometimes 'gloat over.'"—Oxford *Lexicon*, 908a; so Moffatt, *O.T.*, and Davidson, *ad loc.* "Παραδειγματισθῆναι."—LXX.

² Herodotus, ii, 44; Curtius, iv, 15. In 523 B.C. the bond of "solemn oaths" between Tyre and Carthage, in which without doubt Melkart played his part, withstood the will of the Persian emperor.—Herodotus, iii, 19.

³ *Anab.*, ii, 24.

eyes on the transmogrified god. Cæsar in his early days had his ambition whetted by sight of Alexander's statue in the temple of Hercules at Gades.¹

“By the abundance of thine iniquities in the unrighteousness of thy commerce thou hast profaned thy sanctuaries.” The prophet returns to the main charge of commercial degradation as prelude to an all-inclusive doom—the plural, “thy sanctuaries,” reaching to Gades and including Carthage, founded about 850 B.C. The sentence on the god in his native pride was repudiation of all link with Israel, and humiliation before foreign powers; now world-wide extinction is foretold.

“Therefore will I bring forth fire from thy midst.” Moffatt's rendering, “Therefore have I made you set fire to yourself,” is apposite to the friction between Hercules of Tyre and his *alter ego*, Hercules of Thebes; yet to understand “thy midst” of the central Mediterranean settlements is not to impute too much either to the political insight of the time, or to Ezekiel's exactitude of language. In Sicily Syracuse had been founded by a Corinthian Heracleid² in 734 B.C., while in the west of that island the Phœnicians had established the worship of Melkart, particularly at Mount Eryx and Rus-Melkart; and thence, before Ezekiel's century was over, fire came forth from Melkart which was ultimately to annihilate him. To western Sicily, about 510 B.C., came Dorieus of the Spartan Heracleidae, twentieth in descent from Hercules, advised by an oracle to claim the district as representative of the god who owned it.³ He was defeated and slain, but his successor colonised Rus-Melkart as Heraclea Minoa, and this town came to mark the frontier of warring Greek and Punic settlements. 480 B.C. in Sicily saw the defeat and self-immolation of King Hamilcar. After two and a half centuries of Sicilian warfare the son of another Hamilcar, “Tyrian Hannibal,” carried his arms from Melkart's shrine to

¹ Suetonius, *J. Caesar*, 7.

² Thucydides, vi, 3; cp. Strabo, vi, 2, 4.

³ Herodotus, v, 43; vii, 204.

Rome, circling its walls “*usque ad Herculis templum*,”¹ but was foiled in the fulfilment of his vow through the strategy of Fabius Maximus, representative of Hercules at Rome.²

“*It shall devour thee, and I will bring thee to ashes upon the earth in the eyes of all that observe thee.*” *Delenda est Carthago* was the inevitable Roman reaction to Hannibal’s adventure; and in the issue all that the Romans left of Melkart’s New City which, in Pliny’s words, “thirsted so eagerly for the conquest of the whole earth,” was a fathom-thick layer of ashes which excavators found far beneath the present surface, the remnant of the flames of 146 B.C.³ In those ashes the reputation of Carthage’s phoenix-patron lay without hope of *egersis*: in a Roman world Hannibal’s god could not live. The religion of Carthage, says its historian, was, along with its arts, sciences, laws, and literature, “swept away at a single stroke, leaving hardly a wrack behind.”⁴

“*All that know thee among the peoples shall be appalled at thee.*” The Punic attitude in collapse is illustrated in Diodorus’ statements⁵ that on one occasion when hard-pressed the Carthaginians turned to Greek deities, and again that after a crushing defeat in Sicily the survivors durst not embark for Carthage for fear the gods would sink their ships. At least one revealing fact concerning Melkart is on record: the Emperor Caracalla (211-217 A.D.), whose father Severus was a native of a Carthaginian colony and all his life spoke Punic more readily than Latin, put to death a Spanish ex-governor “on the ground that he had consulted the oracle of Hercules at Gades.”⁶

¹ Livy, xxvi, 10.

² Plutarch, *Fabius*, 1; Juvenal, viii, 13-14; Ovid, *Fasti*, ii, 197-201, “That the seed of Hercules’ race might nevertheless survive, it is credible the gods themselves took counsel . . . Assuredly that one day you, Maximus, might be born.”

³ Bosworth Smith, *op. cit.*, 380-1.

⁴ *ib.*, 360.

⁵ xiv, 77; xvi, 81.

⁶ Exc. Val. 390, in Loeb Dio’s *Roman History*, IX, 330.

“*Thou shalt become destruction (“terrors”), and nothing thou for ever!*” This judgment is identical with that on the ship Tyre (xxvii, 36): Melkart is to become wrack and ruin, a derelict god burdened with doom—and, as has been seen, he brought the Heracleid sword against both Tyre and Carthage, while the long contest of his people with the Romans hardened that nation’s animus against the “dying god” and so eventually against Christianity. In the case of his city, “one with Nineveh and Tyre” has for the present generation become a synonym for destruction and nothingness; and if Melkart’s name is not similarly used, it is because the world has forgotten that ever it heard it.

• • • • •

The passage reads as a complete history of the patron god of Phœnicia, as complete after Ezekiel’s day as before;¹ and from this interpretation two vital questions emerge. First, did Ezekiel, to all intent, decide the Punic Wars? No super-human prescience was required to forecast the clash impending between the Phœnician and “the intruders on his ancient home”; and if such content be granted the oracle, it follows that the prophet not only saw the clash but told the end. As predictor of Egypt’s long servitude and Tyre’s delayed nothingness, Ezekiel already has a place in secular esteem; but these feats do not approach in importance the dooming of Carthage, on whose success or failure hung the world’s destiny, the setting of the scene in which Christianity was to be born and nurtured.

Second, did a Hebrew prophet, in full tide of inspiration, with supreme issues involved in every phrase, take occasion in his purpose of denunciation to claim the dying and resurrected god as his ideal? That Ezekiel should have anything good to say of an alien deity is in itself remarkable; that he

1 The tendency of the most recent criticism is against lowering Ezekiel’s date: see Oesterley, *Church Quarterly Review*, July, 1933; M’Fadyen, *Expository Times*, July, 1933. Hertrich, *Ezechielprobleme* (1932), assigns ch. xxviii to period 593-586 B.C. The latter is the textual date.

should say it in such context and so unreservedly indicates some overruling compulsion. No nation's star could be more than "full of wisdom, and perfect in beauty . . . blameless in thy ways." Can Ezekiel's "kinsmen according to the flesh" deny him the credit of having perceived that the way of the seed that perishes is the way of life, or refuse the implication that to the great prophet of Israel's *egersis* the truth for which Melkart stood was truth so established in the heart of the universe that to him perfection was summed, not in a "deathless," but in a "dying" god?

That he was not alone among Hebrew leaders in this attitude the original definition of Israel's heritage as reaching to the meeting-ground of Osiris-Adonis with the Adversary¹ affords concrete evidence: the measure of the "Syrian ready to perish"—heir of a father who was in fact and figure life from the dead (Heb. xi, 12, 19)—was sealed as the legacy of the phœnix.

CAMERON MACKAY.

¹ Afka, death-place of Adonis, and the land of the Gebalites, where Osiris was buried, are indices in Jos. xiii, 4-5.

ART. III.—THE REJECTED CHRIST.

“HE came into his own and his own received him not.” So the author of the Fourth Gospel describes the story which he had to tell. The words describe in any case and describe with poignant truth the story which finds its climax in the crucifixion and its pervading character in the cross. They also mark and account for a dominant note of the character of the Christ, as presented to us in the gospel record. He is the rejected Christ. And they recall and open our eyes to the age-long drama of God and man, in which the mystery of the divine character itself opens to us the overwhelming depth of the divine love, which is to us, as it is in itself, the all-embracing and underlying reality of the world.

But what is the human story of the rejection? Such a story the believer in the incarnation of the Son of God as man must desiderate, if he did not find it written to his hand, and such a story the author of the Fourth Gospel presents to us in his record.

The story which he tells has for background the undying memory of what Jerusalem meant to the Jew, and the splendid vision of what Jerusalem must have meant to the Christ. It is the Jerusalem gospel, and Jerusalem was the place which God had chosen to set his Name there, the home of the knowledge of God revealed to man through the people of his choice, the centre from which that knowledge was to irradiate the Gentile world.

We dare not try to trace the dawn in his human consciousness of the sense of his mission as the Christ, nor measure the steps of the unfolding of all that it meant to that consciousness that he should be declared to be the beloved Son in

whom the Father was well-pleased. But at least from that moment he knew that the hour would come when he must be manifested, not in the circle of the Galilean home, but at Jerusalem, the place which God had chosen.

If this be so, then we can dimly imagine what he felt as he contemplated the closer contact with Jerusalem, Jerusalem not as it might have been but as it was, Jerusalem such as it had been gradually driven home to him that it was in the yearly visits to the sanctuary. And, so far as we can attempt to imagine it, we shall not wonder that, when he claimed the right to purge the worship of God from the associations of a degrading traffic, and did the miracles that would show what he came to do for man, while his disciples wondered that he did not welcome the believers whom he seemed to win, he was not misled into believing that the seed had fallen into fruitful soil.

The story as it is told to us reflects the truth of the spiritual situation. The one representative of the ruling religion of Jerusalem who came to seek him out showed that he was not looking for the new spirit, which the prophets had promised he was to bring, and which it was vital that Jerusalem should desire. There is no sense of surprise, the impression is that he was finding what he expected to find, though it was other than the hope fulfilled with which the master of Israel should have welcomed him.

Are we not then driven to realize the conclusion that already had formed itself in his mind? Sadly—with an infinite and incredible sadness—he had seen that not here, among the “wise and prudent,” were to be found those to whom, “babes” in knowledge as they might be, were to be revealed the things that belonged as of right to the peace of Jerusalem. We can imagine, perhaps, the wrench which such a change of purpose would involve to the heart of any loyal and devout Jew: perhaps we cannot imagine what it meant to him, except in so far as we carry back to the earlier time the burden of the cry of a later day, “O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, how often

would I have gathered thy children as a hen gathereth her own brood under her wings and ye would not."

Every visit that he paid to Jerusalem—for, "whether they would hear or whether they would forbear," they must know that the prophet who had been foretold had been among them—every contact that he had with Jerusalem did but deepen alike their condemnation and his sorrow.

As we see him passing through Samaria on his way to Galilee, even those who were reckoned as most of all outside the pale show him that not, as in Jerusalem, altogether in vain will he offer the water of life to those who can be convicted of sin, or plead for the worship of God in spirit and in truth.

To Galilee the influence of the ruling spirit of Jerusalem follows him, and he breaks into the continuity of the Galilean ministry to challenge in Jerusalem itself the spirit which made the law of the Sabbath an obstacle to the revelation of the life-giving love of the Father—only to reveal the deeper ground for their antagonism in his claim that God is his father.

The next scene carries us to a momentous change of manifested purpose. How long we are to suppose that the issue now indicated had been in view for him we cannot say. "The Galileans received him," and the Galilean ministry has reached the climax which became its crisis at the time of the feeding of the five thousand. The Jews, who had followed him to Galilee, murmur at his speaking of himself, the bread of life, as having come down from heaven. In his reiteration of his claim to be the bread of life he says "The bread which I will give is my flesh for the life of the world." The words can only mean that he will give life to the world by the sacrifice of himself. He has faced the terrible and inevitable fact that they will desire and will achieve his death, this is what it has come to mean for him that his own receive him not.

And more than this, his teaching that life is to be given by the appropriation of the sacrificed life leads many of his disciples to go back and to walk no more with him, so that he turns to the twelve and says: "Will ye also go away?"

It is as though we saw the forces on either side drawing off from one another for the battle. But for him the battle was already won, the dawn of the life through death is already in view, the darkness deepens, but the light prevails.

The darkness deepens, the darkness of their condemnation, as the light that shines in it becomes more manifest. The next scene was at "the feast of the Jews," the feast of Tabernacles, when most of all, if he showed himself, he would show himself to Jews and Galileans alike. Among both he faced an audience of divided minds as to how they should regard him. It is in gleams of light and darkness that we see him. The ultimate issue was clear to him. He had been avoiding Jerusalem because "the Jews sought to kill him." Some at least of his hearers in Jerusalem know that "the rulers seek to kill" him. He himself taxes them all with the purpose of their rulers, "Why seek ye to kill me?" Their purpose is checked while it is provoked by the great utterances of the gospel of life which flash out like lightning-gleams of revelation. "If any man thirst let him come unto me and drink." "I am the light of the world." Those who are drawn to him by his pleading that he is in perpetual dependence on the Father, when they resent his offer that the truth shall make them free, find themselves faced with the final revelation that in him they are rejecting the eternal God himself. It is the inevitable judgment of the eternal Judge issuing in the depths of an awful sorrow from the lips of him who came not to judge the world, but to save the world.

The next scene, at the feast of Dedication, gives us the most tender and winning manifestation of the will to save, as lying behind all that he said and did. The story begins with the healing of the man born blind. But we, who know what is to come, are conscious all the time that it leads us by the vivid picture of the matter-of-fact straightness of vision of the blind man who is healed, to the wilful blindness of his enemies. "For judgment am I come into the world that they, who see not, may see, and they who see may be made blind." Then we pass abruptly from this condemnation of those who

have excommunicated the man who was healed to the tender and winning picture, in the parable of the good shepherd, of the new fellowship into which he had been received. It is the fellowship of those whose bond is "I know my sheep and my sheep know me." They are drawn to the shepherd who lays down his life for the sheep. They know his voice. He gives to them eternal life. He will keep them by the power of the Father, with whom he is one. It is the manifested love of the eternal Father that they reject, the Father who loves the Son because he lays down his life.

And the summary by the evangelist of the consummated rejection is in the words of Isaiah, "he hath blinded their eyes and hardened their hearts, lest they should see with their eyes and perceive with their heart and should turn and I should heal them."

Meanwhile in Galilee, he had been undertaking the new task, which it seemed good in the eyes of the Father to lay upon him, not to convert the church of Jerusalem, with all its traditions of the spiritual past of the nation, into the new fellowship that was to be, but to build up from within, by the infusion of his own spirit, a new spiritual community out of such elements as he could gather among the simple-minded in Galilee.

Even from the first he must have felt, what he expressed in words spoken later in Galilee, "I thank thee, Father, lord of heaven and earth, that thou hast hid these things from the wise and prudent and hast revealed them unto babes." And on the relief which he found in his new work, there fell at first no shadow of the influence of Jerusalem to overcloud his joy. In the synagogue at Capernaum he healed the man with the unclean spirit on the sabbath day, and provoked no protest.

The first note of criticism is on his claim to the divine prerogative in forgiving the sins of the paralytic, and it is in the minds of the "scribes from Jerusalem," that our Lord reads the objection. It is after this that the protests are made

against the violation of the sabbath, and that, when he heals the man with the withered hand on the sabbath, the Pharisees go out and take counsel with the Herodians how they may destroy him.

The scope of his ministry increases. He chooses the twelve to be the core of the new society, and as the multitudes gather round him "the scribes which came down from Jerusalem" show a deeper antagonism. "By the prince of the devils casteth he out devils." The shadow of the struggle which is to come is cast across the story darker and darker, but the progress of the appeal to the Galileans is not arrested. The history of that appeal we are not here attempting to follow. It had its own core of teaching, that righteousness is within, its own dangers from which his disciples had to be defended, the taint of the teaching of the Pharisees, and the infection of the superficial enthusiasm of the multitude, it had its own crisis and its own close, after which his face is turned towards Jerusalem and the end, for which the twelve had to be prepared, and in which, at the end, they were to see his glory.

The occasion of the actual close of the Galilean ministry proper is an attack made by the Jews on the very heart of the Galilean teaching that righteousness is within. "There are gathered together unto him the Pharisees and certain of the scribes which had come from Jerusalem." The point of attack was the disregard by the disciples of the traditional rules against eating with defiled, that is, with unwashen hands. And our Lord's defence, which he "calls the multitude" to hear, is that there is nothing from without a man that going into him can defile him, but the things which proceed out of a man are the things which defile him.

This vital controversy is followed by the words "from thence he arose and went away into the borders of Tyre and Sidon." He retires from the main scene of the Galilean ministry. The time has come to concentrate his efforts on preparing the inner circle of his disciples for the inevitable end. He tests the vital question whether their faith

in him as the Christ has stood the shock of his apparent retreat before his enemies, and as he endeavours to lead them on to what is to come, he shows how inevitable he has long felt to be what is to them still the incredible issue.

St. Luke's story of the transfiguration, with its record of his communing in the glory on the *έξοδος* that he was to accomplish at Jerusalem, links the glory which that *έξοδος* was to accomplish with the death and humiliation in which it was to be manifested.

Over and over again Jerusalem keeps recurring as the scene of the predestined end for which they are to be prepared. In this his own soul is absorbed. "And they were in the way going up to Jerusalem, and Jesus was going before them, and he was amazed, and they that followed were afraid."¹ We seem to see him carrying about him the halo of the glory of the transfiguration. And they record, although at the time they little understood, that when he foretold his death, he also foretold his resurrection.

St. Luke ushers in this whole period with the words "When the days were well-nigh come that he should be received up he steadfastly set his face to go to Jerusalem." The mention that they are on the way to Jerusalem occurs three times in the story, and the burden of it all is gathered up in the cry "O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, how often would I have gathered thy children together, even as a hen gathereth her own brood under her wings, and ye would not" and the echo of that cry seems to sound in our ears at the end when "he beheld the city and wept over it."

It is familiar to us that the man who stood there on the hill above Jerusalem and wept over the city was, as the prophet who foresaw his glory had foreseen, a man of sorrows. But it is well that we should see and feel what the actual sorrow was of which as he stands there he seems to say to us

¹ Mk. x. 32, accepting Turner's reading.

“Behold and see if there be any sorrow like unto my sorrow”—that it was no vague or general sense of the sin of mankind. That this sense was present and pervading we cannot doubt, but in the human fact which is before us it is concentrated in a living, present experience, so that the glory of the long-suffering love of God with the sin of mankind radiates from a living human heart, human as we are human, carrying the pain of the unfaithfulness of God’s people to their God, and of the frustration of the purpose of God’s love, a pain not less poignantly real because the pain itself pleaded for the pardon of the sin which darkened his soul, and for the fulfilment of God’s purpose by the manifestation of his pardoning love in the patience with which it was borne.

If this be so, the Fourth Gospel contributes to the record of a life which we call a “gospel” by enabling us to understand in vivid fact the darkness whose shadow fell upon his soul, and the patience by which it was transfigured into glory, that glory of which he said “The hour is come, that the Son of Man should be glorified,” when through the rejection of his own “he would draw all men unto himself.” The gospel of rejection becomes the gospel of glory.

WILFRID RICHMOND.

ART. IV.—JOHN BRAMHALL.

THE crown of the Anglican church shone with special lustre and scintillating brilliance in the seventeenth century, and not least among her gems was John Bramhall, Archbishop of Armagh, a divine alike of firm conviction and tolerant outlook—a rare combination of qualities distinctive and yet typical of his spiritual mother, the *Ecclesia Anglicana*. In many respects, as will appear, Archbishop Bramhall was a figure of outstanding importance in that century, and it is the purpose of this essay to attempt an appreciation of his importance. He has left to posterity a considerable number of written works which are at once a noble monument to his greatness and a permanent witness to his varied activities. The life of John Bramhall, however—and it was not without variety and adventure—is the most appropriate *prolegomenon* to the study of his opinions and the ultimate explanation of many of his distinctive views.

Bramhall was born at Pontefract about the year 1593, and in 1609 he was admitted to Sidney Sussex College, Cambridge, where he graduated three years later as a B.A. On taking the degree of M.A. in 1616 he left the University and was ordained, and about this time he married a clergyman's widow. This marriage gave him a fortune and a library, "by which," says John Vesey (Bramhall's earliest biographer), "he was so wedded to his studies, that all the temptations of a new-married life could not divorce him from them, or give any intermission to his duty of constant preaching." A few years later he gained for himself a great reputation and in particular won the esteem of Tobias Matthews, Archbishop of York, by two successful public disputations at Northallerton with two Roman Catholic priests, Houghton a secular and Hungate a Jesuit. Any sketch of Bramhall's life would be

incomplete, if it failed to draw attention to his vehement anti-Papal activities which persisted throughout the whole of his life. These disputations at Northallerton were probably the basis of his thesis for the degree of D.D. which he took in 1630, for it is completely permeated by anti-Papal arguments. Several of his more important treatises, moreover, defend the Church of England against Papal claims, and it is interesting to observe how closely alike are Bramhall's arguments and those advanced in the Roman controversy to-day.

The Archbishop of York, Tobias Matthews, made Bramhall his chaplain in 1623, and within a few years Bramhall was installed as a prebendary at York and later at Ripon. On the death of the Archbishop in 1628 Bramhall went and resided at Ripon, where—relates Vesey—"he showed his exceeding great love to his flock, in staying among them in the time of a most contagious and destructive pestilence; visiting them in their houses, baptizing their children, and doing all other offices of his ministry." As a preacher and as a public man, Bramhall had an enormous influence "even"—continues Vesey—"in the elections for members of Parliament, such as he named at Ripon, and other corporations, carrying the vote and favour of the people." In July, 1633, however, he resigned all his English preferments and accepted the invitation of Lord Wentworth, Deputy of Ireland, and of Sir Christopher Wandesford, Master of the Rolls, to go to Ireland as Wentworth's chaplain. In this action Bramhall was evidently impelled by disinterested motives, for he had a good prospect of promotion in his native land "being in as good esteem," according to Vesey, "with Archbishop Neil, then lately, in the beginning of 1632, removed from Winton to York, as he had been with his predecessors, Matthews, Mountain, and Harsnett." He went to Ireland with the single purpose of serving "God and the King in recovering the rights of an oppressed church"; this at any rate is the account given by Vesey of Bramhall's motives in accepting Lord Wentworth's invitation, and there is no reason to doubt its accuracy. So to Ireland he went in July, 1633, and his

poignant picture of the Irish Church in a letter of August 10th to Laud, then Bishop of London, is truly that of "an oppressed church." "For the fabricks," he writes, "it is hard to say whether the churches be the more ruinous and sordid, or the people irreverent; even in Dublin . . . we find our parochial church converted to the Lord Deputy's stable, a second to a nobleman's dwelling house, the quire of a third to a tennis court, and the Vicar acts the keeper. In Christ's Church, the principal church in Ireland, whither the Lord Deputy and Council repair every Sunday, the Vaults, from one end of the Minster to the other, are made into tippling-rooms, for beer, wine, and tobacco, demised all to Popish recusants, and by them and others so much frequented in time of Divine Service, that though there is no danger of blowing up the assembly above their heads, yet there is of poisoning them with fumes. The table used for the administration of the blessed Sacrament in the midst of the choir, made an ordinary seat for maids and apprentices . . . For the clergy; I find few footsteps yet of foreign differences, so I hope it will be an easier task not to admit them than to have them ejected. But I doubt much whether the clergy be very orthodox, and could wish both the Articles and Canons of the Church of England were establish'd here by Act of Parliament, or State . . . The inferior sort of ministers are below all degrees of contempt, in respect of their poverty and ignorance: the boundless heaping together of benefices by *commendams* and *dispensations* in the superiors is but too apparent; . . . insomuch that it is affirm'd that by all or some of these means one bishop in the remoter parts of the kingdom doth hold three and twenty benefices with cure. Generally their residence is as little as their livings . . . For the revenues, how small care hath been taken for the service of his Majesty, or the good of the Church, is hereby apparent, that no officer, or other person, can inform my Lord (*i.e.*, Lord Wentworth) what Deanery or Benifices are in his Majesty's gift, and about three hundred livings are omitted out of the Book of Tax for First Fruits, and Twentieth Parts, sundry of them of good value; two or three Bishopricks, and the whole Diocese of

Killfannore."¹ Such was the state of the Irish Church; Jeremy Taylor, himself an Irish bishop, gives a similar account in his sermon preached at Bramhall's funeral in 1663, and he adds the reasons for this ecclesiastical chaos: "The complaints," he says, "were many, the abuses great, the causes of the Church vastly numerous; but as fast as they were brought in, so fast they were by the Lord Deputy referred back to Dr. Bramhall, who by his indefatigable pains, great sagacity, perpetual watchfulness, daily and hourly consultations, reduced things to a more tolerable position, than they had been left in by the schismatical principles of some, and the unjust prepossessions of others, for many years before: for at the reformation, the popish bishops and priests seemed to conform, and did so, that keeping their bishopricks they might enrich their kindred and dilapidate the revenues of the Church." In his letter to Laud, Bramhall gives himself some measure of satisfaction by reflecting on the condition of the Roman Catholics in Ireland: "It is some comfort to see the Romish Ecclesiasticks cannot laugh at us, who come behind none in point of disunion and scandal." Bramhall is determined to lose no opportunity of exposing the weaknesses—be they disciplinal or doctrinal—of the Roman system.

Bramhall's exertions as a royal commissioner were successful in producing some kind of order out of this chaos, and Vesey records that "he regained to the Church, in the space of four years, thirty or forty thousand pounds a year." Not unnaturally these steps which he took to restore the fortunes of the Irish Church met with opposition, and Bramhall did not lack enemies. "His zeal," says Jeremy Taylor in his funeral oration over Bramhall, "for the recovery of the Church-revenues was called oppression and rapine, covetousness and injustice; his care for reducing religion to wise and justifiable principles was called Popery and Arminianism." It seems strange *prima facie* that Bramhall, whose tendencies were entirely anti-Papal, should have been accused of Popery.

¹ Bramhall's works are conveniently collected in Parker's Library of Anglo-Catholic Theology.

Bramhall was certainly no Papist, but Jeremy Taylor suggests the ground of this accusation in describing Bramhall's restoration of orderliness to divine worship: "His care was not determined in the exterior part only, and accessories of religion; he was careful, and he was prosperous in it, to reduce that divine and excellent service of our Church to public and constant exercise, to unity and devotion." These accusations, however, affected him but little; "he was not," says Vesey, "of a spirit to be terrified from what he thought his duty with noise and ill words."

Shortly after his arrival in Ireland, Bramhall was given the archdeaconry of Meath—the richest in Ireland—and on May 11th, 1634, he was consecrated bishop in the chapel of the castle of Dublin and appointed to the see of Londonderry. Whilst he occupied this see, he improved it and restored to it lands which had been withheld from his predecessors. Bramhall's responsibilities as Bishop of Londonderry, however, did not restrict his national activities, and he continuously strove to restore peace and order to the Irish Church until the year 1637 when he made a journey to England. In November, 1634, the Irish Convocation approved the Thirty-Nine Articles of Religion which had been agreed upon in the Convocation held in London in 1562. The credit of getting this measure passed is given to Bramhall by his biographers; but it appears from a letter written by Wentworth to Laud that the Lord Deputy himself forced it upon Convocation without permitting a word of discussion. Bramhall tried hard to get the Irish Convocation to accept the English Canons of 1604, but the Primate—the famous Archbishop Ussher, who calculated that the precise day of Creation was October 23rd, 4004 B.C.—and many other Irish bishops who were jealous for the liberties of the Irish Church successfully resisted the efforts of the Bishop of Londonderry. Nevertheless, some kind of compromise was ultimately agreed upon, for another body of Canons, compiled by Bramhall, was accepted by the Irish Convocation and received the royal assent. In view of the attitude to-day of many Anglican divines who think that the Thirty-Nine Articles

should be abolished or at least tactfully neglected, Bramhall's words are especially illuminating: "We do not suffer any man to reject the Thirty-Nine Articles of the Church of England at his pleasure; yet neither do we look upon them as essentials of saving Faith, or legacies of Christ and of his apostles; but in a mean, as pious opinions fitted for the preservation of unity: neither do we oblige any man to believe them, but only not to contradict them." The ghost of Bramhall must have rejoiced when in 1865 it was decided that only a "general assent" is required of Anglican ordinands.

In 1637, "having thus"—in the words of John Vesey—"for a considerable time, laboured for the good of others, he thought it time to make some provision for his own family. In order to do it, he took a journey to England." This marks the end of Bramhall's effective work in Ireland until he returned with the Restoration in 1660, for on his return to Ireland in 1638 he was so harassed by accusations and plots that he was forced to embark again for England in 1641. John Vesey tells us that "by his example, his frequent exhortations from the pulpit, his incessant labours with the gentry, and his prudent advices to the Marquis of Newcastle, he put great life into the King's affairs." After the battle of Marston Moor (July 2nd, 1644), however, Bramhall was compelled to embark with the Marquis of Newcastle and several other persons of distinction, and they landed at Hamburgh on July 8th, 1644. Until 1648 he lived in Brussels with Sir Henry de Vic, the King's Resident, "preaching every Sunday, and frequently administering the Sacrament and confirming such as desired it. The English merchants of Antwerp, ten leagues thence, used to be monthly of his audience and communion, and were his best benefactors." In 1648 he attempted to return to Ireland, but after undergoing many dangers and narrowly escaping thence in a small boat, he permanently settled in foreign parts until the Restoration. Now the period between 1649 and 1660 was that of Bramhall's greatest literary activity; he then wrote all his works against the Roman Catholics and against the philosopher, Thomas Hobbes, as well as two against Baxter on the subject of the sabbath day.

In reading these works, therefore, it is important to remember that the author of them was an exile—often living in very straightened circumstances. Thus for a short time Bramhall was reduced to acting as prize-master and even to selling the prizes in person for Charles II during the war between the English and the Dutch in 1653. His zeal for the *Ecclesia Anglicana* never wavered and was perhaps shown most clearly by the fact that whilst he was writing his great Apologies for the Church of England, he was one of the few who alone—at least in appearance—constituted that communion. Some may see in this a burlesque; better minds will admire Bramhall for his zeal. It is, moreover, a singular tribute to his charity and moderation that he refrains from bitter attacks on those who had dispossessed him. If we may be allowed to anticipate what will be said later about his characteristic views on religion and political theory, we would suggest that “moderation” is the motto of Bramhall’s thought.

Of the evening of Bramhall’s days, little more remains to be said. On the Restoration of church and monarchy in 1660, he returned to England—apparently at the earliest possible moment, for Evelyn speaks of “saluting his old friend, the Archbishop of Armagh, formerly of Londonderry,” in London on July 28th, 1660. Promotion was certain, and it was generally supposed that he would be translated to York; but on January 18th, 1661, he was appointed to the metropolitan see of Armagh—vacant since Ussher’s death in 1655. Thus did John Bramhall become Lord Archbishop of Armagh, Primate and Metropolitan of All Ireland, in which office he remained until death concluded in 1663 (June 25th) his interesting seventy years of life. As a result of the period under the Commonwealth, there was much disorder in his diocese, and there existed strong prejudices “both against his person,” says Vesey, “and the doctrine and discipline of the church: but by lenity and reproof, by argument and persuasion . . . he gained upon them even beyond his own expectation . . . By his prudence and *moderation* he greatly softened the spirit of opposition, and effectually obtained the point he aimed at.” During the Commonwealth many

Presbyterian ministers had been given livings, and one of the most difficult tasks of the Restoration-bishops was to secure conformity to episcopacy. Again, Bramhall adopted a policy of moderation "which contrasts favourably, in spirit and results, with Jeremy Taylor's action in Antrim and Down."¹ Bramhall did not, on the one hand, impugn the spiritual validity of Presbyterian orders, nor, on the other, did he refuse to make good the titles to benefices granted under the Commonwealth. But he pointed out to his clergy that it would be difficult—if not impossible—for them to collect tithes in future, unless they could show letters of orders recognized by the existing law. Accordingly, Bramhall prepared a form of letters, certifying that any previous canonical deficiency had been supplied. We cannot but admire this spirit of tactful accommodation, and could wish that the same principle be applied—where possible—to the disorders of Christendom to-day. In Bramhall it is all the more surprising, for—in his writings—he tends to emphasise the necessity of valid ordination and apostolic succession. Thus in one of his works, *A Fair Warning of Scottish Discipline* (1649) Bramhall spares no pains to expose the weaknesses of "the disciplinarians," and one of the grounds on which he opposes them is their deficiency in succession and liturgy. "The poor orthodox clergy in the mean time shall be undone: their straw shall be taken from them, and the number of their bricks be doubled; they shall lose the comfortable assurance of an undoubted succession by episcopal ordination, and put it to a dangerous question, whether they be within the pale of the church; they shall be reduced to ignorance, contempt, and beggary; they shall lose an ancient liturgy (warranted in the most parts of it by all, in all parts of it by the most public forms of the Protestant churches, whereof a short time may produce a parallel to the view of the world), and be enjoined to prate and pray nonsense everlasting." Moreover, Bramhall's powerful refutation of "the nag's-head fable" clearly implies that he valued valid ordination and proper succession. No statement could hardly be more explicit

¹ *Dict. of National Biography* (1886 edition), Vol. VI, p. 205.

than his own words in *A Just Vindication of the Church of England* (1654): "As for our parts, we believe episcopacy to be at least an apostolical institution, approved by Christ himself in the Revelation, and ordained in the infancy of Christianity as a remedy against schism; and we bless God that we have a clear succession of it." Did Bramhall, then, really at the bottom of his heart believe that valid ordination and proper succession are essential to—or are of the *esse* of—the church? His words that we have quoted suggest that he *did*, but his attitude (as Archbishop of Armagh) towards the Presbyterian divines who held livings in his diocese suggests otherwise. Moreover, in speaking of the different forms of church government abroad, Bramhall refers to the Lutheran "superintendents" in Germany, who in fact lacked episcopal or even Presbyterian succession, and he admits the validity of their ministry together with those of the Protestant ministers of Norway and Denmark, though it is only fair to state that these latter had probably preserved the episcopal succession. His recognition, however, of the validity of the German Lutheran ministry clearly implies that Bramhall did not consider episcopal or apostolic succession to be of the *esse* of the church. Now it is significant that another Anglican divine of post-Restoration days, William Beveridge, 1637-1708, Bishop of St. Asaph, lays equal or even greater emphasis on the necessity of valid ordination and succession; yet in doctrine he was on the whole a "Low Churchman" as compared with Bramhall. Why, then, did these bishops—and Bramhall in particular—insist so strongly on the necessity of valid orders and succession? The reason is most probably to be found in the history of the period and in the personal experiences of these divines. Bramhall was forced to be an exile during the period from 1644 until 1660; he was often in dire straits, and "the comfortable assurance of an undoubted succession by episcopal ordination" was swept away. When James I replied to the Puritans: "No bishops, no king," he was giving utterance to a principle, the truth of which Bramhall learnt by bitter experience. Accordingly, in his writings, most of which were written—significantly enough—during his period of exile, he emphasises the necessity (a) of

obedience to the king, and (b) of valid orders and succession. In the *Serpent Salve* (1643) Bramhall is quite explicit on the question of obedience to the king: "Certainly there is no one duty more pressed upon Christians by Christ and his apostles than obedience to superiors . . . Thus for active obedience, now for passive. If a sovereign shall persecute his subjects for not doing his unjust commands, yet it is not lawful to resist by raising arms against him; they that resist shall receive to themselves damnation." Bramhall was evidently determined that, if ever he regained his former security and "the comfortable assurance of an undoubted succession," his published works should lend the greatest support to law and order; he resolved—as did Charles II in 1660—never again to leave England's shores. Bramhall's theory, then, was most probably dictated almost entirely by his own experiences, and this suggestion is confirmed by a consideration of the views of John Cosin (1594-1672), Bishop of Durham. In a letter (dated February 7th, 1650) to M. Cordel at Blois, Cosin expresses in words the principle by which Bramhall was evidently impelled in practice. Thus, speaking of the French Protestants, he says: "Though we may safely say, and maintain it, that their ministers are not so duly and rightly ordained, as they should be, by those prelates and bishops of the church, who, since the apostles' time, have only had the ordinary power and authority to make and constitute a priest, yet, that by reason of this defect there is a *total nullity* in their ordination, or that they be therefore no priests or ministers of the church at all, because they are ordained by those only who are no more but priests or ministers among them, for my part, I would be loathe to affirm and determine against them . . . I conceive that the power of ordination was restrained to bishops, rather by *apostolical practice*, and the perpetual custom and canons of the church, than by any *absolute precept*, that either Christ or his apostles gave about it. Nor can I yet meet with any convincing argument to set it upon a more high and divine institution. From which customs and laws of the universal church . . . though I may truly say that *fieri non oportuit* (when the college of mere presbyters shall ordain and make a priest) yet I cannot so

peremptorily say that *factum non valet*, and pronounce the ordination to be utterly void. For as, in the case of *Baptism*, we take just exceptions against a layman that presumes to give it. . . yet, if once they have done it, we make not their act and administration of baptism void, nor presume we to reiterate the Sacrament after them—so may it well be in the case of *Ordination*, and the ministers of the reformed congregations in France." So, in spite of the " *inorderly ordination* and defect of episcopacy among them," Cosin was quite willing to recognise the validity of their ministers and the efficacy of their Sacraments. This thought is probably much nearer the view of seventeenth century Anglican divines than the theoretical opinions which we find in many of Bramhall's writings. To see the real Bramhall, we must look at his method of dealing with the Presbyterian divines in the diocese of Armagh and at his favourable attitude towards the Lutheran ministry. In view of the emphasis that we have laid upon the "moderation" of Bramhall's views, it is interesting to observe the beginning of Cosin's letter to M. Cordel: "I like your moderation well, in giving so fair and calm an answer to Monsieur Testard's motion for communicating in their church . . ." It is probably not far from the truth to say that the genius of seventeenth century Anglican theology is expressed by the word "moderation."

The sixteenth century is often regarded as the period of fundamental change in English thought; but Mark Pattison's description of the eighteenth century as the *saeculum rationalisticum*¹ has converted many to the view that this was the era of greatest change in English thought. It is fairly clear, however, that with the Stuarts we have left behind the mediæval glamour of the Tudors and have embarked definitely upon the modern world. When James I (1603-1625) hanged a common thief without a trial whilst on his way from Scotland in 1603, it was generally felt that this arbitrary action was somehow out of place; the autocracy of the Tudors—as Charles I and after-

¹ Cf. "Tendencies of Religious Thought in England, 1688-1750" in *Essays and Reviews*.

wards James II found by bitter experience—could no longer be exercised. In the sphere of pure thinking moreover Descartes (1596-1650), “the father of modern philosophy,” revolutionized the course of philosophical method. And that brilliant and scholarly divine, John Pearson (*ob.* 1686), Bishop of Chester, laments the critical temper—so prevalent in his day—which tended to reject everything that was handed down by tradition or guaranteed by antiquity. This “theological Cartesianism,” then, electrified the intellectual atmosphere of Bramhall’s day, and it is a tribute to his “moderate” temper that he rarely shows any reactionary inclination. Perhaps on the Papal question he expressed himself more strongly than a reputable critic would express himself to-day; but (a) the *politesse* of the seventeenth century was different from that of our day, and (b) Bramhall lived much nearer in time to the Reformation which, after all, was a protest against and reaction from Papal abuse. Whilst mentioning seventeenth century *politesse*, we cannot refrain from quoting two passages from Bramhall in his controversy with Thomas Hobbes. “He hath passed over,” he says, “a great part of my Defence untouched: but I have not omitted one sentence throughout his Animadversions, wherein I could find any one grain of reason; and among the rest, have satisfied his silly censures or ignorant exceptions in their proper places; and the splinters of those broken reeds stick in his own fingers.” Or, again, in *The Catching of Leviathan*, a description of Hobbes’ works proves that Bramhall’s language does not lack decision and force. “But it is not worthy of my labour,” he says. “nor any part of my intention, to pursue every shadow of a question which he springeth. It shall suffice to gather a posy of flowers (or rather a bundle of weeds) out of his writings, and present them to the reader; who will easily distinguish them from healthful plants by the rankness of their smell.” These are hardly polite words, but Hobbes’ reference to Bramhall’s “hard words” and “nonsense” of the schools, and “little logic” and “no philosophy” was certainly provocative.

Thomas Hobbes’ opinion of Bramhall’s philosophical ability however seems amply justified by some of Bramhall’s

own words. Hobbes was a nominalist. Accordingly, he denied the existence of "universals"; "horseness," for example, or the "universal" of horses in the abstract is a mere *name*. Bramhall finds this opinion stated in Hobbes' works, but completely misses the point. "Here," says Bramhall, "he would gladly be nibbling at the question, whether universals be nothing but only words: 'Nothing in the world,' saith he, 'is general, but the significations of words and other signs': hereby affirming unawares, that a man is but a word, and by consequence, that he himself is but a titular and not a real man. But this question is altogether impertinent in this place. We do not by a general influence understand some universal substance or thing, but an influence of indeterminate power, which may be applied to acts of several kinds. If he deny all general power in this sense, he denieth both his own reason, and his common sense." A philosopher Bramhall certainly was not. But as an apologist of the Church of England against Papal aggression, Bramhall is preëminently valuable and important; and it is to this aspect of his works that we will now turn.

To-day the Roman controversy is largely pivoted on the question of Papal infallibility: can the Pope as Christ's vicar dictate to the whole of Christendom? But not so in the seventeenth century; in Bramhall and other Anglican divines of that period we find that almost the whole argument is centred on the question of Papal jurisdiction; can the Pope, as chief bishop of Christendom, interfere in the politics of individual nations and particularly of England? It would be idle to pretend that nowhere is there mention of Papal infallibility, but it is not primary. In several places Bramhall does refer to Papal infallibility, and in *A Just Vindication of the Church of England* we find a statement about the vagaries of the Pope's "exorbitant privileges" which seems equally applicable to the Decree of Infallibility as promulgated in 1870 by Pius IX. "The best is," says Bramhall with biting sarcasm, "that they who give these exorbitant privileges to Popes, do it with so many cautions and reservations, that they signify nothing,

and may be taken away with as much ease as they are given. The Pope (say they) is infallible, not in his chamber, but in his chair; not in the premises, but in the conclusion; not in conclusions of matter of fact, but in conclusions of matter of faith; not always in all conclusions of matter of faith, but only when he useth the right means and due diligence. And who knoweth when he doth that? So every Christian is infallible, if he would and could keep himself to the infallible rule which God hath given him: ‘Take nothing, and hold it fast.’” Bramhall’s main contention however is that the King of England and the English church were always superior to and independent of the Pope and the Roman court. “Our kings,” he asserts, “from time to time called Councils, made ecclesiastical laws, punished ecclesiastical persons, and saw that they did their duties in their callings, prohibited ecclesiastical judges to proceed, received appeals from ecclesiastical courts, rejected the laws of the Pope at their pleasure with a ‘nolumus’ . . . or gave legislative interpretations of them as they thought good, made ecclesiastical corporations, appropriated benefices, translated episcopal sees, forbade appeals to Rome, rejected the Pope’s Bulls, . . . condemned the excommunications and other sentences of the Roman court, . . . enjoyed the patronage of bishoprics and the investitures of bishops, enlarged or restrained the privilege of clergy, prescribed the endowment of vicars, set down the wages of priests, and made acts to remedy the oppressions of the Court of Rome.” Bramhall then argues that the English Reformation under Henry VIII merely followed the lines of this typically English independence and freedom; “what,” he asks, “did King Henry the Eighth in effect more than this?” But what is perhaps most distinctive of Bramhall’s anti-Papal arguments is his contention that the Church of England is older than the Church of Rome. “If we compare,” he writes, “the ages and originals of the Roman and Britanic churches, we shall find that the Britanic is the more ancient and elder sister to the Roman itself; the Britanic church being planted by Joseph of Arimathea in the reign of Tiberius Cæsar (A.D. 14-41), whereas it is confessed that St. Peter came not to Rome, to lay the foundation of that church,

until the second year of Claudius (A.D. 41-54), . . . so if we look to the beginning, according to the direction of the Council of Ephesus, the Britannic church in its first original was free from the jurisdiction of the bishop and court of Rome, where there was neither bishop nor court nor ecclesiastical jurisdiction at that day." We may—on critical grounds—doubt or even deny the historicity of the legend which associates Joseph of Arimathea with Glastonbury or with any other part of Britain; nor can we but wonder whether Bramhall would have accepted this legend if it had not supported his anti-Papal polemic. We can still appreciate however the point of Bramhall's argument that from the beginning the Britannic church was " free from the jurisdiction of the bishop and court of Rome," and that the English Reformation was partly due to the violation of that freedom on the part of the Roman court. Accordingly—and this is fundamental in Bramhall's argument—he emphasises that the Catholic church has gone on continuously from the time of the apostles and continues as the Church of England whilst the Roman church is in schism. He argues this position very well, and constantly points to the equivalence of the Romanists to the Donatists. Thus in *A Replication to the Bishop of Chalcedon* (1656) we find this passage, which is typical: "The Donatists most uncharitably did limit the Catholic church to their own party, excluding all others from hope of salvation, just as the Romanists do now, who are the right successors of the Donatists in those 'few things,' or rather in that one thing. So often as he (*i.e.*, the Bishop of Chalcedon) produceth St. Austin against the Donatists, he brings a rod for himself." Even in the Papal controversy however Bramhall's inherent "moderation" shows itself, for in answer to the accusation that they had "already extirpated" the Papacy out of England, Bramhall still acknowledges that some kind of primacy—a sort of Canterbury of Christendom—attaches to the Roman see. "No," he replies, "we have only cast out seven or eight branches of Papal jurisdiction in the exterior court, which Christ or his apostles never challenged, never exercised, never meddled withal; which the church never granted, never disposed. He might still for us enjoy his Protopatriarchate, and the dignity

of an apostolical bishop, and his 'primacy of order,' so long as the church thought fit to continue it to that see; if this would content him." Never before perhaps since the schism between East and West in the eleventh century have there been more sincere and nobler efforts made for the peace and unity of Christendom than those which are being made to-day; but Bramhall is conspicuous—though not unique—in his century as a wise and practical peacemaker, and his suggestions hold good, not only in the circumstances of the seventeenth century, but equally well in those of to-day. No eulogy on Bramhall or exposition of his works commends him as much as his own words in *A Just Vindication of the Church of England*. "I determine nothing," he writes, "but only crave leave to propose a question to all moderate Christians, who love the peace of the church, and long for the reunion thereof: in the first place, if the Bishop of Rome were reduced from his universality of sovereign jurisdiction *jure Divino*, to his 'principium unitatis,' and his court regulated by the Canons of the Fathers, which was the sense of the Councils of Constance and Basle, and is desired by many Roman Catholics as well as we: secondly, if the creed or necessary points of faith were reduced to what they were in the time of the four first Oecumenical Councils, according to the decree of the third general Council (who dare say that the faith of the primitive fathers was insufficient?) admitting no additional articles, but only necessary explications; and those to be made by the authority of a general Council,¹ or one so general as can be convoked: and, lastly, supposing that some things from whence offences are either given or taken (which, whether right or wrong, do not weigh half so much as the unity of Christians), were put out of divine offices, which would not be refused if animosities were taken away and charity restored: I say, in case these three things were accorded, which seem very reasonable demands, whether Christians might not live in a holy communion, and join in the same public

¹ Bramhall constantly wishes that a general Council should meet to re-unite the Church, and—incidentally—he emphasises the superiority and supremacy of a general Council over the Pope.

worship of God, free from all schismatical separation . . . notwithstanding diversities of opinions, which prevail even among members of the same particular churches, both with them and us." Or—as he summarises the conditions in *Schism Guarded* (1658)—"to reduce the present Papacy to the primitive form, the essentials of faith to the primitive creed, and public and private devotions to the primitive liturgies." These are "such as themselves cannot deny to be lawful, and all moderate men will judge necessary to be done." Bramhall's views, then, on the method of reunion are perfectly explicit. The basis of his suggestions is a plea for primitive belief and practice; and it is not unnatural that, after seeing the church torn asunder by schism and civil war, Bramhall and many another seventeenth century divine should long for "the love of the brethren" of the primitive church. Thus William Beveridge, Bishop of St. Asaph, constantly appeals to "the primitive and apostolical church"; and Bramhall's "three expedients" for reunion (above) consist essentially in primitive administration, primitive belief, primitive practice. Side by side with this appeal to the primitive church, there is — in seventeenth century theology in general—a fairly consistent appeal made to the church of the fathers, though it is to be observed that patristic works and events are quoted with discrimination. Especially is this the case with Bramhall, who—with no hesitation—states his critical use of the fathers in connexion with the papal claim "to be St. Peter's heir *ex asse*." "We receive the fathers," he asserts, "as competent witnesses of the faith and practice and tradition of the church in their respective ages; we attribute much to their expositions of the holy text; but, in those things which they had upon the credit of a supposititious author, the conclusion always follows the weaker part. How common a thing hath it been for credulous piety to believe and to record rumours and uncertain relations, if they see no hurt in them, and if they tended to piety? But in a case of this moment—to give an infallible judge to the church and a spiritual prince to the Christian world, to whom all are bound to submit under pain of damnation—we ought to have had better authority than such a blind history. Yet this is

all the plea they have in the world for the divine right of their succession. How came St. Ambrose, or St. Gregory, to know a matter of fact done some centuries of years before they were born? They had it not by revelation; nor other authority for it than this of a counterfeit Hegesippus, in the judgment both of Baronius and Bellarmine (except only the borrowed name) not much ancienter than themselves." We could wish that modern controversialists should follow Bramhall in his discriminating use of the fathers, instead of the unhappy practice of appealing for support to a patristic passage often torn violently from its context.

No account of Bramhall would be complete which omitted any mention of his refutation of the Nag's Head fable—that "senseless fabulous fiction," as he calls it. Bramhall's *magnum opus* on this subject is *The Consecration and Succession of Protestant Bishops Justified* (1658) wherein he claims to have "clearly confuted" that "infamous fable," and it is only fair to say that Bramhall has substantiated his claim. Although he did not have access to all the now-available evidence, yet—with what material he did have—he has shown clearly that there is not an atom of truth in the fable. In *A Just Vindication of the Church of England* the subject recurs, and "against which lying groundless drowsy dream, we produce," says Bramhall, "in the very point the authentic records of our church, of things not acted in a corner, but publicly and solemnly, recorded by public notaries, preserved in public registers . . . There is no more certainty of the coronation of Henry the Eighth, or Edward the Sixth, than there is of that ordination . . . done not by one (as Austin consecrated the first Saxon prelates) but by five,¹ consecrated bishops." From the sub-title of chapter iii of his *Consecration of Protestant Bishops Vindicated* we get a good summary of Bramhall's weightiest arguments against the fable: "Three reasons against the Nag's Head consecration; I. From the contradictions of the relaters; II. From the lateness of the discovery;² III. From the strictness of our laws." John

¹ This is a mistake; there were *four*.

² The earliest mention in print was in a book published at Antwerp in 1604.

Bramhall's refutation of this unhappy invention is still worthy of perusal. Before we leave Bramhall's remarks on the Roman question, we should like to draw attention to his upholding of the claims of the see of Antioch as stronger than those of Rome to primacy. This is a good point, and he asks "how the Bishop of Rome came to be St. Peter's heir *ex asse* to the exclusion of his eldest brother the Bishop of Antioch, where St. Peter was first bishop, where Christians had their first denomination. I had reason, for I never read that the church was governed by the law of gavelkind, that the youngest must inherit."

In the year 1651, a French Roman Catholic, de la Milletiere, who had been expelled from the reformed communion about the year 1645, wrote a work entitled *The Victory of Truth for the Peace of the Church*, inviting Charles II to embrace "the catholic faith." To this work Bramhall wrote a reply which was first printed at the Hague in 1653; it is a powerful answer to de la Milletiere and contains some valuable remarks on transubstantiation, which figured prominently in the Roman controversy of the seventeenth century. "I find," he replies, "not one of your arguments that comes home to transubstantiation, but only to a true Real Presence; which no genuine son of the Church of England did ever deny, no, nor your adversary himself. Christ said, 'This is my body'; what he said, we do steadfastly believe. He said not, after this or that manner, *neque con*, *neque sub*, *neque trans*. And therefore we place it among the opinions of the schools, not among the Articles of our faith. The Holy Eucharist, which is the Sacrament of peace and unity, ought not to be made the matter of strife and contention." Perhaps no verdict on Bramhall's treatment of the Roman question is fairer than that uttered by Jeremy Taylor: "He stated the questions so wisely, and conducted them so prudently, and handled them so learnedly, that I may truly say, they were never more materially confuted by any man, since the questions have so unhappily disturbed Christendom."

The controversy aroused by Cosin's introduction of ceremonies and furniture into Durham cathedral is a good illustration of the outlook of not a few seventeenth century divines, who—in modern terminology—were High Churchmen. In his *Consecration of Protestant Bishops Vindicated*, Bramhall touches on the subject of ceremonial, and his wise and moderate remarks claim by their very merit our serious consideration. After referring to "the wisdom of the English church for paring away superfluous ceremonies in ordination," he continues: "Ceremonies are advancements of order, decency, modesty, and gravity in the service of God, expressions of those heavenly desires and dispositions, which we ought to bring along with us to God's house, adjurements of attention and devotion, furtherances of edification . . . the shell that preserves the kernel of religion from contempt . . . When ceremonies become burdensome by excessive superfluity, or unlawful ceremonies are obtruded, or the substance of divine worship is placed in circumstances, or the service of God is more respected for human ornaments than for the divine ordinance; it is high time to pare away excesses, and reduce things to the ancient mean." We see this same atmosphere of wise moderation infusing Bramhall's able remarks on the observance of the Lord's day. Thus in *A Vindication of Grotius and Episcopalian from Popery* (published after the author's death at London in 1672), we find these words: "If Mr. Baxter thinks that no recreations of the body at all are lawful or may be permitted upon the Lord's day, he may call himself a 'catholic' if he please,¹ but he will find very few churches of any communion whatsoever, old or new, reformed or unreformed, to bear him company . . . As for the public dances of our youth, on country greens, upon Sundays after the duties of the day were done, I see nothing in them but innocent, and agreeable to that under sort of people. But if any man . . . do disaffect them, either because they were sometimes used promiscuously, or for any

¹ It is noticeable that Bramhall nowhere rejects the name 'Catholic'. "I like," he says, "the name of Catholic well, but the addition of Roman is in truth a diminution."

other reasons, I think it easier to regulate those recreations which should be allowed, than to brawl about them perpetually until the end of the world."

We have observed (above) Thomas Hobbes' contempt for Bramhall's "little logic" and "no philosophy," and—with regard to the latter—we have seen the truth of Hobbes' criticism. In the controversy, however, which Bramhall engaged in with Hobbes, it is only fair to admit that Bramhall puts forward a convincing case. There are three works of Bramhall in which he criticises the view of Hobbes: (i) *Castigations of Mr. Hobbes' Animadversions*, (ii) *A Vindication of True Liberty against Mr. Hobbes*, and (iii) *The Catching of Leviathan*. In his preface "to the reader" of the second of these works, he remarks: "I will . . . demonstrate, that his principles are pernicious, both to piety and policy, and destructive to all relations of mankind, between prince and subject, father and child, master and servant, husband and wife; and they, who maintain them obstinately, are fitter to live in hollow trees among wild beasts, than in any Christian or political society." And these sentiments are again expressed on the title-page of *The Catching of Leviathan*; in fact, "no man, who is thoroughly a Hobbeſt, can be a good Christian." Bramhall's language is perhaps a little strong; but to seventeenth-century minds, this seventeenth-century Bertrand Russell—such was Hobbes—must have seemed a pernicious "radical," for the seventeenth century still tended to think in terms of medieval political-theory and domestic-practice. Hobbes, on the other hand, had little respect for the Schoolmen, because he was obsessed by the futility of much of their syllogistic reasoning and consequently blind to the sound work which lay behind this subtlety. But Bramhall defends them. "It may be," he writes, "the Schoolmen have started many superfluous questions, and some of dangerous consequence; but yet I say, the weightier ecclesiastical controversies will never be understood and stated distinctly without the help of their necessary distinctions." The first two controversial works against Hobbes (above) treat of the problem of divine necessity

and moral freedom, and it is here that Bramhall's Arminian tendencies appear. Hobbes was convinced that there is no free-will; hence his opposition to the Schoolmen, and Bramhall quotes some of his words: "He pleadeth that he 'doth not call all school learning jargon, but . . . that which they say in defence of untruths; and especially in the maintenance of free-will.'" It would provide an interesting study to observe how consistently British divines have held semi-Pelagian views. The opinions defended on both sides have—as in the controversy between Pelagius and Augustine—been cultivated in the soil of personal experience and nourished by the emotions of the individual's temperament. It is therefore not surprising that the stolid, "once-born" character which is inherent in the British race should regard the problem from a Pelagian or semi-Pelagian point of view. Accordingly Bramhall is not in any sense a determinist, and he thinks that it is possible for *all* men to go to heaven. "We believe," he says, "none are excluded from the benefit of Christ's passion but only they who exclude themselves." And Bramhall has no doubt as to what he means by liberty; "true liberty consists in the elective power of the rational will." Man can of himself turn to God for his grace and secure assurance of salvation. It is no wonder, then, that—as Jeremy Taylor tells us—Bramhall was in Ireland accused of Arminianism, although his eulogiser attributes this to "his care of reducing religion to wise and justifiable principles." Bramhall's "wise and justifiable principles" must have been particularly abhorrent to Calvinistical Ireland.

One thing in particular to which Bramhall took exception was Hobbes' view of the Bible, for Hobbes was what we might call a seventeenth century "modernist." In criticising his views on the Bible, Bramhall gives us his own opinion, which seems to show no marked divergence from the views expressed by Pope Leo XIII in his encyclical *Providentissimus Deus*¹ which was promulgated in 1893. Thus Bramhall writes: "I should esteem it no difficult task to demonstrate perspicuously, that the Holy Scriptures can be no other than the word of God himself; by their antiquity, by their harmony, by their efficacy,

¹ Cf. the phrase "Sancto spiritu dictante."

by their sanctity and sublimity of their matter, such as could not have entered into the thoughts of man without the inspiration of the Holy Ghost."

Interest in the ecclesiastical writings of the seventeenth century lies not only in the distinctive views of their authors, but also in the fact that they are the product of a period which looked back across the comparatively narrow gulf of less than a century to what represents—after the upheavals under Edward VI and Mary—the practical outcome of the English Reformation—that is, the Elizabethan settlement. Many and varying are the interpretations to-day of the Reformation, and amid the welter of opinions the views of a seventeenth century divine stand out as worthy of attention, if only because of his nearness in time to the events which have ever since been the matter for debate and controversy. Bramhall states quite explicitly what he considers to be the nature and causes of the Reformation. The "prime actors"—Cranmer and others—"were not private persons, but public pastors of the church . . . Yet these were not our reformers, but the synods and Parliaments of our kingdom under the sovereign prince, the synods proposing, the Parliament receiving, the king authorising." The Reformation, moreover, "was not seditious, tumultuous, nor after a fanatical or enthusiastical way, but done with all requisite helps, taking the church to be their pattern, and the Holy Scriptures, interpreted according to the analogy of faith, to be their rule." And "the subject of their reformation . . . was not other churches but their own, so it was not of 'articles' of 'faith' . . . but it was of corruptions which were added of later times, by removing that 'hay and stubble' which the Romanists had heaped upon the foundation." Finally—a not unimportant point—"we have not left the Catholic church, but only the Roman church; and that not absolutely, but in their superstructures, which they have added to the doctrine of saving truth."

The history of the seventeenth century reveals a process which tended to reverse the destruction and abolition of ecclesiastical ornaments which had taken place during the later years

of Edward VI's reign, and the charge of "innovating" was not infrequently brought against the bishops. In a *Discourse of the Sabbath and Lord's Day* Bramhall replies to this charge: "In the name of God what are they? Is 'bowing at the name of Jesus' an 'innovation'? . . . A strange innovation indeed, which is as ancient as the Gospel; and so universal, that all the churches . . . do practise it, except three or four petty churches of late days . . . The eighteenth canon of our church doth prove it to be no innovation . . . Or is the innocent name of an altar, which all the primitive church used without any scruple, or the placing it at the east end of the quire, or the bowing towards the east when we enter the quire, an 'innovation'? It is just such another innovation, for antiquity and universality . . . We are no innovators; but they who accuse us of innovations, are both innovators and veterators."

No conclusion to this essay could be more fitting than a passage taken from Jeremy Taylor's funeral oration over Bramhall in Christ's Church, Dublin: "He was a wise prelate, a learned doctor, a just man, a true friend, a great benefactor to others, a thankful beneficiary where he was obliged himself. He was a faithful servant to his masters, a loyal subject to the king, a zealous assertor of his religion against popery on one side, and fanaticism on the other. The practice of his religion¹ was not so much in forms and exterior ministries, though he was a great observer of all the public rites and ministries of the church, as it was in doing good for others . . . He took care of his churches when he was alive, and even after his death, having left five hundred pounds for the repair of his cathedral of Armagh and St. Peter's church in Drogheda. He was an excellent scholar, and rarely well accomplished; first instructed to great excellency by natural parts, and then consummated by study and experience . . . In him were visible the great lines of Hooker's judiciousness, of Jewel's learning, of the acuteness of Bishop Andrewes . . . He showed his

¹ Religion—in Bramhall's own words—must be "neither garish with superfluous ceremonies, not yet sluttish and void of all order, decency, and majesty in the service of God."

equanimity in poverty, and his justice in riches; he was useful in his country, and profitable in his banishment." Well may we—with Jeremy Taylor—"pray God that at least his mantle may be left behind, and that his spirit may be doubled upon his successor."

CHARLES NYE.

ART. V.—CURIOLANUS AND SHAKESPEARE'S "TRAGIC COURSE."

IN his recent book, *The Essential Shakespeare*, Professor Dover Wilson likens the dramatist's path, between 1601 and 1608

to a mountain track which rising gently from the plain, grows ever narrower, until at the climax of the ascent it dwindles to the thinnest razor-edge, a glacial arête, on either hand . . . Eight plays compose this tragic course (pp. 119, 120).

The last of these eight is *Coriolanus*, of which he writes: its fault is that the dramatist seems hardly to be concerned in it at all: his spirit is elsewhere upon some new quest (p. 121).

On a previous page he refers still more depreciatingly to the comparative emptiness of *Coriolanus* (p. 113).

The front page article of *The Times Literary Supplement* for December 15th, 1932, treating of Shakespeare's *Last Phase*, with an eye apparently on *The Essential Shakespeare*, approached the theme from another side, asking how "Shakespeare may have regarded his past work on the completion of *Coriolanus*." Both, as most critics do, separate this series of Tragedies, *Julius Caesar*, *Hamlet*, *Othello*, *King Lear*, *Timon of Athens*, *Macbeth*, *Antony and Cleopatra*, *Coriolanus* from all the rest, regarding them as having some inner connexion, with each other and in relation to Shakespeare's own mood and attitude. While Mr. Dover Wilson bluntly depreciates *Coriolanus*, *The Times*' critic admits its rights to a place among the rest, though, if it were last in time, not to finality of content:

May he (Shakespeare) not have felt that no other aspect of the tragic fact remains to be unfolded after

traversing the long way that leads from *Julius Caesar* to *Coriolanus*, or that he could never express it more perfectly? Can he have been unconscious of the finality of *King Lear* as a presentation of the tragic possibilities of life, which though in time it is not the last of the tragedies exceeds them all in universality and range, and in depth of feeling for the travail of the whole creation?

The aim of the following pages is to rebut Mr. Dover Wilson's strange charge of "comparative emptiness"; to support his suggestion of a "new quest," rather however of a fresh direction, and so to agree with *The Times*' critic's view of this play's significance and place in the "tragic course," and finally to propose the nature of "the aspect of the tragic fact" underlying *Coriolanus*, whether or no Shakespeare was fully conscious of its source.

Both critics admit that each of these eight plays has a different motive, though Professor Dover Wilson implies that if Shakespeare had, in *Coriolanus*, clear intention, it petered out into the alleged "comparative emptiness" because he was thinking of something else: a something which, whatever the "new quest" might be, was no aspect for this particular play. His chapter, "The Razor-Edge," the most constructive if not everywhere convincing, in his book, essays to indicate, omitting *Coriolanus*, the several motives of these tragedies; motives which need no recapitulation here. As a reader reflects on these said "aspects," he may wonder if one be not lacking?—one contemporary human condition left out? Surely there was, one which had reached England, fully fructifying just then, so that William Shakespeare—

"you writer of plays
Here's a subject made to your hand!"—

viz., the *ὕβρις*, the *superbia*, the inordinate pride of the renaissance: pride, the first of the seven deadly sins, and "the darling sin" of the later, decadent, Italian renaissance.

England in general, Shakespeare in particular, may not have been fully alive to, percipient of the essence of the move-

ment, of its developing influence, first in Italy, then in England, France and otherwhere. But, in every great movement, few if any of those caught up in it, are wholly aware of their surroundings' inner meaning and trend. Moreover intense, even excited, self-consciousness was as foreign to Jacobean as it seems natural to many to-day. True, the influence of the Italian renaissance had long been working in England; almost ever since Petrarcha had collected Greek MSS. he could not read, though he gladly paid men to copy and disseminate them, so paving the way for sundry exiled Greek scholars to make Florence their home, and eventually for the establishment of the school of Vittorino de Feltre, gentlest, most persuasive and single-minded of pedagogues. Richard de Bury, whose *Philobiblon* still kindles with life, actually met Petrarcha at Avignon: who can estimate now, what inspiration he brought away and spread? English students, clerical and lay, Humphrey of Gloucester, John Tiptoft, Earl of Worcester, William Grey, later Bishop of Ely, the Bristol man, Johannes Phreas (John Free as he is better known) and the Benedictine, Selling, all alike "night and day haunted by the vision of Italy, that next to Greece, was the nursing mother of men of genius," Hadley, possibly of All Souls, Linacre, and the rest went to Italy to glean from the harvest which Italian poets, scholars and teachers had raised from seeds brought from classic soil. That early flowering was far from Shakespeare's source. He was moved by a later stage, of which Lorenzo dei Medici, the baffling Sigismonde Malatesta, and other "despots" were the stormy petrels, and Leo X, the over-blown product, not only in his pagan insolence, but in his excess, in that fatal lack of poise, that sundering of essential wholes which drove Creighton to declare that if Leo had known anything of Christianity, and Adrian VI anything of humane letters the course of history might have been changed.

That the influence of this decadent stage of the movement was active in Shakespeare's England, Professor Dover Wilson

shows by remarking that James' favourite, Robert Carr, had brought into English life

a strain . . . which reminds us of the poison and debauchery of the decadent Italian renaissance. Such things did nothing to stem the tide of melancholy which deepened and became more extravagant as time went on . . . until it seems to rage with frenzied madness in the plays of Webster, Ford and Tourneur, and to sweep with sombre magnificence through the sermons of Dean Donne (p. 114).

Possibly Shakespeare had not consciously, still less deliberately, contemplated this stupendous, and still unfinished movement. Further, Mr. Wilson may have due grounds for claiming that

Shakespeare's tragedies might reflect personal feeling and inner spiritual experience.

For all that, no man, not even Shakespeare, can keep his "personal feeling and inner spiritual experience" wholly untouched by the dominant issues of his age; were it possible how thinned would be the experience, how starved the feeling. That he was affected by the renaissance spirit may be inferred from the fact that evidence of it must be diligently sought, in more than one play, and that even so it remains somewhat fugitive. Otherwise its presence would not be so often overlooked.

That "hubris," inordinate pride, was a main element in the whole renaissance mood is beyond dispute. Following, mingling with it, came sensuality, the grossest immorality, and a callousness hideous in its totality. It is the first of these, inordinate pride, which, in whatever degree or none he realised its source, Shakespeare embodied in Caius Marcius: an extravagant insolence which gives the Play not "emptiness" indeed, but the intolerable tragedy of intrinsic nobility wantonly self-ruined. Surely that entitles this Play to as defined a place in

Shakespeare's "tragic period" as any of the other seven can claim?

If we would discover Shakespeare's loan of renaissance immorality and callousness, *Richard III*, strangely underrated as it sometimes is, furnishes it. In soliloquies, he shews an immorality so sheer, that even Queen Margaret's furious denunciation can hardly make it more monstrous; and it is as deliberate as Cesare Borgia's. Some may find his chill immorality nearer to the Italian type than Webster's "frenzied madness."

Richard's callousness, the very temper of that age which, when "hubris" fell, edged the pain of the collapse with culminating acuity, is not less deliberate. If any one would catch a shadow, remaining still, of this most frightful renaissance quality, let him, in June's sunshine in Touraine, follow the Indre's course, with water-lilied backwaters, pass the forests where Louis XII hunted boars, till the elegant *tourelles* of the Château at Loches rise white against the sky's blue radiance. Let him leave all those and descend to the dungeon where Louis kept, almost without light or air, and wholly without outlook, one of the most hubristic of contemporary men, Lodovico Sforza. As, in Il Moro's painted script, if tradition can be trusted, he reads Francesca's lines, in French dress—

Il n'y au monde plus grande destresse,
Du bon tempts soi souvenir en la tristesse—

then let him remember that when Lodovico married Beatrice d'Este, her elder sister, Isabella, had fully shared in the brilliant festivities and now did not hesitate to dance with Louis in his ball room above this *cachot*, where alone and hopeless, her brother-in-law ate out his soul.

In this complete callousness Richard III can match Louis and Isabella:

Was ever woman in this humour woo'd?
 Was ever woman in this humour won?
 I'll have her, but I will not keep her long.

Hath she forgot already that brave prince
 Edward, her lord, whom I, some three months since
 Stabb'd in my angry mood at Tewkesbury?
 A sweeter and a lovelier gentleman
 Framed in the prodigality of nature
 Young, valiant, wise, and, no doubt, right royal,
 The spacious world cannot again afford.

I do mistake my person all this while!

I'll be at charges for a looking glass—
 And entertain some score of tailors.

But first, I'll turn yon fellow in his grave,
 And then return lamenting to my love!

No shadow of immorality falls round Coriolanus:
 O a kiss

Long as my exile, sweet as my revenge!
 Now, by the jealous queen of heaven, that kiss
 I carried from thee, dear, and my true lip
 Hath virgin'd it e'er since.

Nor, is he callous: with wounds unsalved, straight from the
 dust and noise of almost single-handed battle, scornful of all
 praise, he, remembering a debt, begs a boon from his
 General:

I sometime lay here in Corioli
 At a poor man's house: he used me kindly.
 He cried to me; I saw him prisoner;
 And then Aufidius was within my view,
 And wrath o'erwhelmed my pity: I request you
 To give my poor host freedom.

Whether or no he recognised its source, its significance—for it is the business of later time to grasp and label the tendencies of earlier days—Shakespeare, if he ever went on that “quest” for one more tragic motive for his cycle, can hardly have been uninfluenced by the English version (for always the English give to outside influences a native direction) of renaissance “hubris.”

Though his debt to Plutarch, in this Play, sometimes extends to verbal reproduction of North's translation, for its substance, direction and subtler issues his loans were meagre. Thus, the admirable Comenius, great, moderate, real, is wholly Shakespeare's. In Menenius' case, he drew nothing from Plutarch save the apologue of the Belly and its Members. Sometimes, when Menenius is on the stage, Montaigne seems strangely near; even so, the old man's heart-wringing outburst has no flavour of the author of *Que sçais-je?*:

I neither care for the world nor for your general: for such things as you, I can scarce think there's any, ye're so slight: . . . I say to you, as I was said to, Away!

Once, in *Shakespeare's Debt to Montaigne*, Mr. Coffin Taylor, collecting parallel passages, remarks:

They point clearly to the conclusion that in almost every instance, Shakespeare before arriving at his destination, had made a détour through the forest of Montaigne.

But he produces from the *Essais* no hint of Menenius. Nor when he turns from likeness of single thought or phrase to discuss substance does it seem to occur to him that Menenius' wit, irony, fundamental urbanity recall Montaigne, the *fine fleur* of one late renaissance mood. Another small indication of its influence is furnished by Valeria. For though he follows Plutarch's account of “the noble sister of Publicola,” Shakespeare leaves the impression of a great lady indeed, but neither Roman nor Jacobean. Valeria would have fitted the Court of Guido Ubaldo, Duke of Urbino, and its Conference, presided over by the Grand Duchess Elizabeth Gonzaga, as

Castiglione described it in his *Courtier*. She might have played the part of the Lady Emilia Pia, who as "chief Manager on these Occasions . . . inspir'd all the Company with Life and Understanding."

Whether or no Shakespeare's Coriolanus incarnated renaissance "hubris" Plutarch's account does not suffice for this man all compact of pride. His quiet reminder, "a man that will live in this world must needs have patience" has little relation to so colossal a figure; though it may explain, what without it, seems the fatuity with which this or that patrician incessantly urges "patience" on this unmanageable man. As well might they try to tie up a thunderstorm in brown paper and string. It is still more important to note that the passage where Plutarch excuses Marcius by pleas of "orphanage" and "lack of education" describes a man entirely unlike Shakespeare's Coriolanus:

for lack of education he was so choleric and impatient that he would yield to no living creature: which made him churlish, uncivil and altogether unfit for any man's conversation.

Whereas, despite his dominant pride, Coriolanus is none of that, save at times "choleric and impatient." Furthest of all is he from being a character of one quality only: for a Roman soldier he is subtle. How can Plutarch's description fit Menenius' claim?

I tell thee, fellow,
Thy general is my lover . . .
For I have ever verified my friends,
Of whom he's chief;

or Comenius'

Yet, one time, he did call me by my name;

or Titus Lartius'

O general,
Here is the steed, we the caparison?

Who can call "uncivil" the Coriolanus of
O, my sweet lady, pardon!

How untrue it is that "he would yield to no living creature":

My mother bows
As if Olympus to a molehill should
In supplication nod . . .

O, mother, mother!
What have you done?

Perhaps in no other play does Shakespeare fit his majestic, noble rhythm more exactly to the consummating emotions of the main actors than in the critical scene where Volumnia pleads with her son till he yields.

It is another noteworthy fact that as he lets Coriolanus' excess of pride culminate in the final scene, but wastes no words in mere description, so nowhere does he attempt to paint his physical portrait; though, of others, Richard III, Julius Caesar, Cleopatra, he more than hints at their appearance. What actually was Coriolanus like? As we look long at Pisanello's beautiful medal of the Lord of Rimini, extreme in every form of contemporary excess, not least in pride; as we note the male beauty of that face, its colossal and ruthless force, lined not, despite his record, with sensuality but with superbest pride, it is easy to fancy that Coriolanus may have been of Sigismondo Malatesta's type.

And, at last, when, his overweening *superbia* caught in irremediable eclipse, he lies outstretched, Aufidius' foot on the body from which, in life, he had fled, what is it all but the ever sudden and startling paradox of the renaissance?

As if to provide the needed contrast, Shakespeare stresses the pride of all his friends: Comenius, Menenius, Titus Lartius, the patricians generally and senators, even the citizens, all indeed save the envious tribunes, are proud: but it is of and for him. A few lines suffice for his mother's, his wife's. Volumnia's:

I would my son
 Were in Arabia, and thy tribe before him
 His good sword in hand,
 provokes Sicinius' retort:

What then?

Before she can reply, Virgilia (and it might have saved her from silly charges of futility) breaks in:

What then?

He'd make an end of thy posterity!

Pride theirs is, but of quite another sort from his. Volumnia's comes nearest, but has elements his lacks. Apart from her class-pride, which *au fond* is deeper than his (because he knows the citizens' worth individually, realises that being misled by demagogues they are easily carried away by the *dementia* which can sweep any crowd off its customary feet), Volumnia claims nothing for herself: her whole desire is for him. Moreover, in her there is an emotional strain:

Good man, the wounds that he does bear for Rome!

We know his opinion of those:

Scratches with briers,
 Scars to move laughter only.

This emotion escapes again when she reminds him:

thou restraint from me the duty which
 To a mother's part belongs.

Then, moving in its simplicity, there is the last appeal:

My first son,
 Whither wilt thou go? Take good Cominius
 With thee awhile: determine on some course
 More than a wild exposture to each chance
 That starts i' the way before thee.

Her anger too is emotional, impulsive, on the one occasion when it breaks bounds:

Now the red pestilence strikes all trades in Rome
 And occupations perish;

while he is shot through, saturated with his inordinate pride:
I banish you!

Not to over-labour a point, perhaps it will suffice to suggest that while we can hardly imagine Volumnia without Coriolanus or fit her into any scheme wherein he had no part, he is thinkable without his mother, indeed without any and everybody. His two brief soliloquies, in Act IV, reveal much. This once only, Shakespeare shews him as a philosopher; so strangely detached too, coldly, impersonally analytical of misfortune, though in its bitterest midst:

O world, thy slippery turns! Friends now fast sworn,
Whose double bosoms seem to wear one heart,
Whose house, whose bed, whose meal and exercise
Are still together, who twin, as 'twere, in love
Unseparable, shall within this hour,
On a dissension of a doit, break out
To bitterest enmity: so, fellest foes,
Whose passions and whose plots have broke their sleep
To take the one the other, by some chance,
Some trick not worth an egg, shall grow dear friends
And interjoin their issues. So with me:
My birth-place hate I, and my love's upon
This enemy town. I'll enter: if he slay me
He does fair justice; if he give me way,
I'll do his country service.

His taunt to Aufidius is the supreme instance of his lonely pride:

If you have writ your annals true, 'tis there
That like an eagle in a dove-cot I
Flutter'd your Volscians in Corioli.
Alone I did it!

Alone!—the essence of “hubris”! Here, Shakespeare had found “one other aspect of the tragic fact.”

For the defect of Coriolanus is not Julius Caesar's mere pride of place:

For always I am Caesar!—

nor Lear's senile exaggeration of legitimate power, nor Cleopatra's aristocratic disdain joined to feminine pride in having at her feet all men save the cold Caesar. It is comparable to nothing but the inordinate excess of insolence with which the renaissance had familiarised men.

Professor Wilson then is justified in his idea of "some new quest." But is there a shred of truth in his suggestion that "the dramatist seems hardly to be concerned in it at all, his spirit is elsewhere"? For however verbally close Shakespeare's text is at times to Plutarch the great interpretations, the crucial elements of the tragedy clearly have some other source; an impossible state of things were the playwright inattentive, "elsewhere."

Professor Bradley has raised yet one more point. He suggests that Coriolanus, unlike Macbeth, "saved his soul." Perhaps! But a man lies under further obligations: to abstain from damaging others, and to achieve his own latent possibility. Though, on the brink of crowning crime, Coriolanus drew back, refused, still that inordinate pride remained. It is all but his last utterance:

Alone I did it!

He could not undo the ruin his pride had wrought, in how many ways, for others, not least for the wretched Aufidius, the contemptible Sicinius; both living on worse men through contact with his pride. And, if he "saved his soul," he still could never reduce the contrast between what he was and what he could have been.

Alone I did it!—

at once self-revelation and the key of his self-ruin.

GERALDINE HODGSON.

ART. VI.—SAINT STEPHEN AND THE ROMAN COMMUNITY AT THE TIME OF THE BAPTISMAL CONTROVERSY.

IT may seem presumptuous to open any further discussion of the baptismal controversy. This conflict provides us with the most important material which bears upon the early history of the papacy, and for this reason it has attracted the attention of all the leading historians. The amount of literature dealing with it is so enormous that the subject would seem to be exhausted, especially as the original sources at our disposal are so scarce. And yet, despite this, there remain some problems of real importance in this controversy which have never been solved, and there are some inconsistencies in the usual representation of the policy of the various leaders which have never been adequately explained. The following points must be specially mentioned as real stumbling-blocks in the study of the baptismal controversy. The first is a most puzzling change in the policy of St. Stephen, who at the beginning displayed great tolerance and was even inclined towards laxity, as in the cases of Marcianus, of Arles,¹ and of two Spanish bishops;² but who later showed extreme rigidity and aggressiveness in his dealings with St. Cyprian and with the other bishops of Africa.³ The second point of difficulty is a disagreement among historians as to the chronology of those of St. Cyprian's letters which deal with the baptismal controversy. Finally there is the problem of Firmilian's place in the conflict and the reason for his violent intervention.

Despite very divergent estimates of the doctrine and

¹ St. Cypr. Eps. 68.

² St. Cypr. Ep. 67.

³ St. Cypr. Ep. 75 (25).

policy of St. Cyprian and St. Stephen, all historians, irrespective of their confessions, agree that in St. Stephen we have the most aggressive pope of the early centuries, one who, in his determination, surpassed even Victor, the first pope to claim universal authority for his see. We have already discussed in another article the possibility of a certain misconception in the traditional interpretation of Pope Victor's policy.¹ It is even more probable that a similar misrepresentation of Stephen's personality and conduct hinders the study of the baptismal controversy.

The period between the end of the second century and the year 254 when St. Stephen was elected to the bishopric of Rome was a time of great unrest and of manifold conflicts inside this community. Besides a number of varying gnostic sects, which probably had a more or less independent existence, there were other divisions among the catholic members of the Roman Church. We learn from Eusebius that during the time of Victor's episcopate (189-199) "others, of whom Florinus was chief, flourished in Rome. He fell from the presbyterate of the church and Blastus² was involved in a similar fall. They also drew away many of the church to their opinions, each striving to introduce his own innovations in respect of the truth."³ A little further on Eusebius mentions various efforts on the part of St. Irenæus to restore peace at Rome, which, however, had no success.⁴ This conflict within the Roman community had world-wide repercussions and is

¹ Eusebius and the Paschal Controversy (*Church Quart. Review*, April 1933).

² Blastus was one of the leaders of those who revolted against Victor's attempts to introduce uniformity in Rome in the celebration of Easter: "to all these there is likewise Blastus who would latently introduce Judaism, for he says the passover is not to be kept otherwise than according to the law of Moses, on the fourteenth of the month." Pseudo-Tetullian, *Liber de Praescript. adv. Haereticos.* ch. 8. Migne P.L. t. 11., col. 72.

³ Eus. H. E., V. 15.

⁴ Eus. H. E., V. 20, 1.

well known to us under the name of the Paschal controversy. The situation in Rome was not improved after Victor's death, for during the pontificate of his successor, Zepherinus (202-218) Hippolytus describes the life of the community as suffering from "faction between the brethren."¹ We know the names of several of Zepherinus' rivals, Noetus, Cleomenes,² Natalius,³ and others. The matter became even worse under Callistus (218-222) when Hippolytus himself appeared as the rival bishop, and continued his opposition during the pontificates of the next two popes, Urbanus (222-230) and Pontianus (230-235). The reason for this latter schism was the conflict between the group of more learned and austere rigorists led by Hippolytus and the rest of the Roman Christians. Hippolytus' description of it is an important witness to the general state of affairs in Rome, and it is at the same time the key to the understanding of the causes of the troubles during St. Stephen's episcopate. Hippolytus writes as follows: "For if any one who has been received by another and calls himself Christian should transgress, Callistus says the transgression of him will not be reckoned against him if he hastens to his school.⁴ And many were pleased with this proposition, having been stricken with conscience as well as cast out by many heresies. And some even after having been cast by us out of the church, by a regular judgement, joining with these last filled the school of Callistus."⁵ This vivid description of the inner conditions of the Roman Church contains two points of importance: (a) the Roman Christians used to transfer their allegiance from one to another of the numerous Christian schools into which they were divided; (b) Callistus, the bishop of the Catholic community, inaugurated the practice of receiving indiscriminately converts from heretical bodies. Hippolytus does not explain the nature of the rite by which

¹ *Philosophumena*, B. IX. ch. 11, p. 435.

² *Hippol. Pholos*. B. IX, ch. 7, p. 425.

³ *H.E.V.* 28 (8-13).

⁴ *i.e.* to the Catholic community of the Roman Christians.

⁵ *Phil.* B. IX, ch. 12. p. 443-444.

Callistus admitted the converts, but the passage suggests the imposition of the bishop's hands and not rebaptism, which was the usual procedure of the other churches. This supposition is confirmed by the fact that if Callistus really rebaptised schismatics and heretics, he would have extended this practice to the members of Hippolytus' community; this additional offence would certainly not have been passed over in silence by his opponent. Hippolytus mentions in another place "a second baptism" introduced by some Christians under Callistus.¹ But this rebaptism has nothing to do with Callistus' reception of schismatics and heretics. For Hippolytus does not ascribe its introduction to Callistus himself and he connects it with the heresy of Elchesaites, which consisted of preaching rebaptism as a means of a fresh remission of sins for already baptised Christians.²

We do not need to enter into an analysis of the doctrinal issues involved in the conflict between the rival tendencies of rigorism and comprehension in Rome. It seems obvious that the latter was much stronger numerically, and was usually recognised by other churches as representing the Catholic community. The party of rigorists however was also held in esteem, especially in the East: its leader, Hippolytus, was highly venerated both during his life and especially after his martyrdom, so it would appear that little regard was paid to the fact that he was a schismatic bishop.³ His death in 235 brought to an end the first stage of the conflict but it again broke out in the clash between Cornelius and Novatian in 251. In that year, the rigorists, dissatisfied with Cornelius' promotion to the Roman See, once more elected their own man to the same chair, a very learned and energetic presbyter called Novatian. The latter seemed to be aware of the circumstances of the failure of his forerunner, Hippolytus, who received poor support in the Roman community, and

¹ Under Callistus a second baptism has been ventured upon by them for the first time. *Philos. B. IX*, ch. 12, p. 446.

² *Hippol. Philos. B. IX*, ch. 13.

³ See *Dictionary of Christian Biography*, Vol. III, pp. 85-89.

immediately after his election he sent a powerful appeal for recognition to the churches throughout the world.¹ This was a wise move, for the large majority of the other communities had a more rigid discipline than the Catholics in Rome and were naturally inclined to support the man who insisted as Novatian did upon the rebaptism of the heretics and schismatics. Novatian's claims were recognised by several Eastern bishops.² Soon however it became obvious that Novatian, in spite of this response, was to be no more successful than Hippolytus.³ There were probably two main reasons for his defeat. The first was that the large majority of the Roman Christians was uncompromisingly opposed to rigorism and was determined to reject the rule of its representative; the second, that the leading bishop in the West, St. Cyprian of Carthage, was opposed to Novatian and had immediately started a most energetic campaign against him.⁴ St. Cyprian's intervention greatly helped Cornelius and it put St. Cyprian almost into the position of supervisor of the life of the Roman community.⁵ The other bishops followed St. Cyprian's example,⁶ and Cornelius gradually got universal recognition.⁷ Novatian, however, did not give up his claims and very soon his position was strengthened by Cornelius' exile in 252, quickly followed by the latter's death. Cornelius' successor, Lucius, occupied the see of Rome for only a few months and also perished in banishment; persecution did not allow the

¹ Eus. H.E. VI 44 (1), 45, 46 (3). St. Cypr. Ep. 44 (1).

² For instance, the Church of Antioch, the leading community of the East, recognised him as the bishop of Rome. Eus. H.E. VI, 44 (1). St. Cypr. Ep. 55. St. Cyprian's correspondent, Antonianus, was also inclined to support Novatian, Ep. 55 (10). It seems also that Helenus of Tarsus, Firmilian, and Theoctistus were in favour of Novatian's claims. Eus. H.E. VI, 46 (3).

³ Eus. H.E., VI, 46 (3).

⁴ St. Cypr. Eps. 44, 55, 59, etc.

⁵ See the dictatorial behaviour of St. Cyprian towards Stephen during the Gaulish appeal. Ep. 68 (2-3).

⁶ See the case of the Church of Adrumetine and St. Cyprian's influence upon its decision to recognise Cornelius. Ep. 48 (2-3).

⁷ St. Cypr. Ep. 68 (2).

Catholics to elect their new bishop Stephen until 254 and thus for the two years following Cornelius' exile Novatian remained without a rival Catholic bishop in Rome.

Such was the situation within the Roman community when St. Stephen came to his see. The three years of his episcopate form a stormy period in the history of the Church of Rome and it is the contention of this essay that they were entirely occupied in self-defence against the continual attacks of Novatian and against the attempts of other churches to interfere in the disturbances in Rome and to impose their will upon the divided Roman Christians.

The first event to reveal the character of the new episcopacy was Stephen's conflict with the Eastern bishops led by Firmilian.

This occurred soon after St. Stephen's election and it is described in Firmilian's letter to St. Cyprian¹ as St. Stephen's attempt to excommunicate all the Eastern churches. Several references to it are also contained in various of Dionysius' epistles preserved by Eusebius.²

Firmilian's account of this first quarrel gives an impression of extreme aggression on the part of St. Stephen who, as soon as he was elected to his see, attempted, apparently, to excommunicate all the churches whose practice in regard to rebaptism of heretics and schismatics differed from that of Rome. Firmilian however does not give the reason for such a policy, which in view of the strained situation within the Roman community is not easily explained. Dionysius provides us, however, with information which throws a helpful light upon this obscure and yet very momentous conflict. This is to be found in the extract from St. Dionysius' letter to St. Stephen preserved by Eusebius. The latter begins the quotation of the original document with a rather confusing introduction: "Dionysius, therefore, having communicated with St. Stephen

¹ St. Cypr. Ep. 75 (24).

² Eus. H.E. VII, 4, 5,

extensively on this question by letter, finally showed him that since the persecution had abated, the churches everywhere had rejected the novelty of Novatus,¹ and were at peace among themselves.”² This is Eusebius’ commentary, and the original text follows. “But know, my brother, that all the churches throughout the East and beyond which formerly were divided, have become united. And all the bishops everywhere are of one mind . . . Thus Demetrianus of Antioch, Theoctistus of Caesarea . . . Helenus of Tarsus, and . . . Firmilianus and all Cappadocia . . . And all Syria, and Arabia to which you send help when needed and whither you have just written, Mesopotamia, Pontus Bithinia, and in short all everywhere are rejoicing and glorifying God for the unanimity and brotherly love.”³ This passage, read together with Eusebius’ preface to it, states that all the churches in the East once more unanimously rejected Novatian’s claims and were ready to restore their communion with Rome, as had already been done by the churches of Arabia.

Two questions are raised by this extract. Firstly, when did this conflict take place, and secondly, what was its cause? As to the first question it seems to be obvious that this conflict occurred at the very beginning of the short episcopate of St. Stephen; for Firmilian places the split with the East considerably earlier than St. Stephen’s quarrel with St. Cyprian.⁴ Thus this clash between St. Stephen and the bishops led by Firmilian almost coincided with St. Stephen’s election. What then could be the reason for it?

If Eusebius’ commentary on Dionysius’ letter is accurate then we have the answer to the second question. It would

¹ It is obviously a mistake, and Novatian is meant here.

² Eus. H.E. VII, 4.

³ Eus. H.E. VII, 5 (1-2).

⁴ “For what is more lowly or meek than to have disagreed with so many bishops throughout the whole world, breaking peace with each one of them in various kinds of discord; at one time with the Eastern Churches, as we are sure you also know; at another time with you who are in the South . . .” Ep. 75 (25)

seem that St. Stephen's hostility to the Easterns was due to their attempt, during the vacancy of the Roman see, to recognise Novatian as the head of the Catholic community in Rome. We have already seen that in 251 Fabius of Antioch and probably Firmilian, Helenus and others were inclined to support Novatian. The opposition of the Roman Christians and the energetic campaign of St. Cyprian and St. Dionysius forced them to withdraw their support. Later, when the see of Rome became vacant, Novatian probably made a new appeal for recognition.¹ It was favourably received by the Eastern churches who hoped that this would cure the schism.² They were the more inclined to support Novatian as in doctrine they were entirely on his side³ and the Roman party of comprehension seemed to them to represent a dangerous departure from the apostolic traditions.⁴

¹ Between 253-257 Novatian "stirred to renewed activity and became a formidable enemy to ecclesiastical discipline." Lawlor and Oulton, *Eusebius*, Vol. II, p. 235 (London, 1928).

² Similar means of healing schisms were applied on several occasions by the ancient Church, as for instance in the early dealings with the Donatists and with the Melitian schism in Egypt (Kidd, *Hist. of Church*. I. p. 537; II, pp. 41-42).

³ Fabius and many other bishops of Asia Minor shared the doctrines professed by Novatian (Eus. H.E. VI, 41-44 [1]; 46 [3]) and they were therefore inclined to recognise him as the bishop of Rome. The Easterns seemed to be little concerned with the constitutional irregularity of his election, which was the main cause of St. Cyprian's determined opposition to Novatian's claims. (St. Cypr. Eps. 44 [2], 55 [8-24], 59 [6], etc.) Their disregard of ecclesiastical discipline is well demonstrated by their support of Origen who, although condemned by his bishop and by the synod of his own Church, found a refuge in Firmilian's diocese and was treated by the Asiatic and Palestinian bishops as a lawful presbyter. (Eus. H.E. VI, 19 [17-19], 23 [4], 26, 27. Hieronim. de Vir. ill. 54. Ep. 33. Pallad, Hist. Laus. 147.) This is another proof of the fundamental difference between the attitudes of Firmilian and St. Cyprian towards the place of the episcopate in the life of the Church and therefore also towards the Novatianist schism; this point has an important bearing upon Cyprian's life struggle to apply in the life of the Church his new theory of Church unity.

⁴ St. Cypr. Ep. 75 (6).

The second attempt¹ of the Easterns to recognise Novatian was again a complete failure. The majority of the Roman Christians once more rejected Novatian and elected as their bishop Stephen, a man who stood for a radical relaxation of the ancient rigid discipline.

St. Stephen's episcopate began therefore in the face of Eastern opposition, which lasted, however, only a short time as we know from Dionysius' letter.²

If this was the reason for St. Stephen's conflict with the Easterns it can hardly be used as an example of his aggressiveness. On the contrary, his position was one of defence, for he had to meet the attacks of the Easterns. The latter, in fact, interfered in the life of the Roman community and provoked in this way the conflict with Stephen.³ This explains why St. Stephen found himself involved in conflict with remote churches of Asia Minor immediately after his election, and at the same

¹ The first attempt took place in 251 in the time of Fabius of Antioch. *Eus. H.E.* VI, 43, 3-22, 44 (1), 46 (3-4).

² *Eus. H.E.* VII, 4; 5 (1-2).

³ Eusebius' list of Dionysius' epistles dealing with the Baptismal Controversy provides us with another important illustration, both of the intensity of the inner struggle in Rome as well as of the amount of active participation in the trouble by the other Churches. He mentions a "diaconal epistle" addressed to the Roman Community, which was written before the election of St. Stephen, during the vacancy of the Roman See. (*Eus. H.E.* VI, 46 [5]). This expression *διακονική* caused considerable difficulty to historians who have attempted to explain it. Valesius, for instance, interpreted it as referring to the duties of a deacon; Magistris thought that it had to be read by a deacon (see McGiffert, *The Church History of Eusebius*, p. 292, and Lawlor and Oulton, *Eusebius* II, p. 236.) These explanations were obviously unsatisfactory. The expression, however, becomes intelligible if we translate it as epistle "of service," which means that the Roman Community, being in a state of great disturbance and unrest received brotherly advice from Dionysius, who, however, did not pretend to have any authority over the Roman Church. His next epistle, mentioned also by Eusebius, is entitled "on peace," and offers yet another proof of the intervention of the other Churches into the Roman troubles and of the amount of disturbance there at that period.

time it is not inconsistent with Stephen's policy during the next conflict with Marcianus of Arles, whom he refused to condemn, although the former also practised the rigoristic discipline of the Novatianists.

Before this interpretation can be accepted, account must be taken, however, of another extract from Dionysius' letter to pope Xystus which seems to presume a different course of events. Dionysius writes, "Stephen therefore had written previously concerning Helenus and Firmilian and all those in Cilicia and Cappadocia and Galatia and the neighbouring nations saying that he would not hold communion in future with them either for this same reason, since, says he, they rebaptise heretics."¹ This passage seems to imply that Stephen insisted upon the Roman practice as obligatory for all the churches and that this was the cause of his trouble with the Easterns.

It is, however, hardly possible to build much upon so short an extract from an otherwise unknown document. Moreover it says that Stephen only threatened the Easterns with a breach of communion but did not actually apply this weapon against them. Dionysius in another letter mentions the restoration of peace between them, but he leaves unanswered the question of the conditions on which it was established. The following explanation may be found satisfactory. The bitterness of Firmilian's letter makes it clear that it was Stephen, not the Easterns, who was the victor. Yet, as Firmilian states explicitly in his letter to St. Cyprian, the Easterns had obviously retained their practice of rebaptism and as late as the fourth century St. Basil the Great speaks of the existence of rebaptism in their churches.² It is obvious then that the concessions obtained from the Easterns were of another nature. This can only mean that they agreed to withdraw their support of Novatian and that, for St. Stephen, the question of rebaptism, although the strongest controversial weapon, was not the only issue of the conflict.

¹ Eus. H.E. VII, 5 (4).

² First Canonical Epistle, Canon 1.

This supposition is further confirmed by the history of the appeal of the Gaulish bishops.¹ Space forbids us to enter into a detailed description of this important event. It would suffice to state that Marcianus of Arles (251-254)² adopted the most rigoristic attitude towards the lapsed and refused to reconcile them to the church, even on their deathbeds. His congregation was probably divided as to the righteousness of this policy and no local action could be taken. Faustinus, the bishop of Lyons, with the other Gaulish bishops, interfered in this local conflict and they sent letters to Rome, to Carthage and to other leading churches, asking for help and advice. St. Cyprian showed a great concern for the matter, but Stephen apparently ignored it. We have St. Cyprian's letter to Stephen³ urging him to intervene in the troubles in Arles and openly to disassociate himself from Marcianus.⁴ We do not know anything about the consequence of this letter, nor about the final settlement of this conflict.

There are, however, two points of importance in this story which bear upon the relations between St. Stephen and St. Cyprian. The first is that St. Cyprian's letter clearly shows that he is accustomed to command his other colleagues, including the Roman bishops. He does not even ask Stephen's opinion about Marcianus but simply sends him full instructions for his action and expects his quick and prompt compliance. The second is St. Stephen's obvious unwillingness to interfere in the conflict at Arles. The last point needs certain elucidation.

¹ There is a divergency among historians as to the chronology of the Spanish and Gaulish appeals. The arguments for placing the Gaulish appeal first are, however, so strong, that they need hardly be repeated here. See Bardenhewer, *Gesch. Alt. Kirch. Lit.* Vol. II, p. 487.

² Benson, *Cyprian*, p. 317.

³ Ep. 68.

⁴ The reason for St. Cyprian's insistence upon Stephen's action against Marcianus is explained by Karl Muller on the ground that the Church of Arles was the daughter Church of Rome and still dependent on its mother community. *Zeitsch. für N.T.W.* 1929. *Beiträge zur Alten Kirchengesch.* pp. 300-308.

tion. As long as it was thought that St. Stephen was a pope whose principal concern was the spread of papal influence all over the world, Stephen's attitude was incomprehensible. But it appears the most natural course of action for him, if only we disassociate our minds from this idea and approach St. Stephen as a bishop engaged in a difficult struggle against his energetic adversary Novatian. In this case his policy in regard to the other churches would be as far as possible one of non-intervention.

This approach to Stephen's policy seems to be contradicted by the next event of his episcopate, the so-called Spanish appeal, related in another of St. Cyprian's letters.¹ Stephen entered into communion with a lapsed bishop from Spain called Basilides, who came in person to Rome. The result of Stephen's action was that Basilides and his other lapsed colleague, Martial, recovered their lost sees and expelled the bishops who had already been elected in their stead. The latter fled to Carthage and implored St. Cyprian to intervene in this conflict. St. Cyprian took the keenest interest in their cause and gave them one of his most eloquent epistles, signed by thirty-seven African bishops, and addressed to their local congregations. In it he explained the utter impossibility that the church should restore the lapsed clerics to their office. He makes several allusions to Stephen's action and attributes it to his lack of information. This conflict has been a real puzzle to church historians. Every detail of it seems to raise further difficulties. It was strange for instance that a bishop from a small and obscure Spanish church not only got to Rome, but was solemnly restored to his see, in violation of all church traditions. It was even more surprising that his lapsed colleague, Martial, also acquired his see, although he obviously did not appear in Rome, so that his case could not have been judged by Stephen. The appeal of the dissatisfied party to Carthage against the Roman verdict was yet another puzzle. Finally the arguments of St. Cyprian's letter, in spite of their eloquence, seemed to lack logic. He writes that Stephen's

¹ Ep. 67.

action was caused by the latter's ignorance as to the true character of the fall of the Spanish bishops. Yet he does not suggest that more accurate information should be sent to Rome. On the contrary he goes into a most detailed theological argument in support of a thesis that never and under no circumstances can a lapsed cleric be restored to his see, as if there was more than an occasional mistake in Stephen's action and as if he had to protest against a new policy started by the Roman bishop. This last supposition is the real key to the understanding of the Spanish appeal. Stephen indeed inaugurated a most drastic departure from the traditional policy of the church by starting to restore lapsed clerics to their previous sacerdotal functions. Yet although this was an unprecedented action it was only a further step along the lines already taken by the majority of the Christians in the third century. In order to understand the nature of the conflict between St. Stephen and St. Cyprian we must consider the general policy of the early church towards the lapsed.

In the ancient church moral offences or the abjuration of Christ during persecution were punished with excommunication. A person who suffered this punishment as a rule remained under suspension until his death. This severe discipline became unbearable as the number of Christians increased,¹ and Pope Callistus, according to St. Hippolytus,² took the first step towards amending it. He admitted a possibility of complete recovery of church membership for those Christians who were excommunicated for some carnal sins. Hippolytus also accuses him, with special bitterness, of still more radical change in the ancient discipline, namely, of restoring to their office clerics condemned for the same transgressions.³ Thirty years later St. Cyprian and Pope Cornelius took a second step in the same direction. They admitted the right of those Christians who had abjured Christ during the persecution to be reconciled to the church, but they were not

¹ Harnack, *Hist. of Dogmas*, II, p. 115.

² The Philosoph. B. IX, ch. 12, p. 443.

³ The Philosoph. B IX. ch. 12, p. 444.

prepared to go further than that, and considered it quite impossible for a lapsed cleric to be received back otherwise than in lay communion.¹

The gradual relaxation of the old rules was gladly welcomed by the majority of Christians, with the exception of the Novatianist party, and hence there is nothing improbable in the fact that St. Stephen should have decided to complete the reform begun by St. Cyprian and Cornelius, and to allow even lapsed clerics readmittance to their chairs. Moreover he had some special and very serious reasons for its immediate introduction. The Decian persecution had been characterised by a new policy: the Christians were now tortured and imprisoned but seldom put to death. The government desired to make apostates but not martyrs.² This system was mainly used in Italy and its chief victims were bishops, presbyters, and other leading Christians. Many of them were probably otherwise good pastors, beloved by their flocks, and their communities would gladly welcome their restoration to their office, for the number of Christians capable of being bishop and presbyter were naturally limited in small places. Thus a new method of dealing with the lapsed clerics soon became a strong weapon in Stephen's hands against his numerous adversaries, for those restored by him naturally formed a body of his firm and ardent supporters. Probably the new policy of the Roman bishop soon became known in all the provinces of the Western Empire.³ Basilides was the first Spanish bishop to apply this

¹ Ep. 67 (6).

² Turner, *Studies on Early Church History*, Oxford 1919, p. 109.

³ The policy of St. Stephen, however, eventually failed, for probably even his immediate successor Xystus (Pontius, *Vita Cypr.* 14) reverted to the discipline which had existed in the Roman Church during the episcopate of Cornelius, and in the later centuries the doctrine that a lapsed cleric cannot be restored to his office resumed its sway in the West. (Canon XIII of the Council of Arles, 314). That is one of the reasons why we have so little information about the most radical of St. Stephen's reforms which produced such acute anxiety both in Spain and in North Africa.

new rule for his own benefit. In spite of his fall he had obviously a large number of supporters, but he dared not himself violate the traditions of the whole church. As soon as he heard of Stephen's action he undertook a voyage to Rome, possibly carrying a letter of reconciliation obtained from his local congregation. Stephen acted according to his new principles and communicated with him as with a lawful bishop. The authority of Rome was great in small and remote communities, and Basilides was recognised on his return by his church. He was, however, not able to convince all the Christians who, seeing that Rome violates the traditions of the past, appealed to the next church of importance in the West—to Carthage.

This interpretation of the Spanish appeal solves many difficulties and accounts for many facts that cannot otherwise be explained. But there is one obstacle in the way of its acceptance; namely the absence of any direct allusion in Ep. 67 to St. Stephen's general decision about the restoration of lapsed clerics. This silence can, however, be explained by the peculiar difficulties of St. Cyprian's position. A lapsed cleric, in his view, was deprived of his office by God himself and nobody could mitigate the finality of the divine judgement;¹ the innovation introduced by Stephen was a complete contradiction of the whole charismatic conception of priesthood held by St. Cyprian, yet he probably still hoped to bring St. Stephen back to the true doctrine and did not want to make an open breach with him.

These two factors determined the content of the epistle St. Cyprian sent to the Spanish churches. On the one hand the letter is a solemn declaration, signed by thirty-seven bishops, that there is no power in the church to change the divine law that a lapsed cleric loses his order and office. On the other hand, St. Cyprian does not attack St. Stephen directly. He tries to represent his action as a misunderstanding and his

¹ Ep. 55 (ii).

communion with Basilides¹ as the result of deception on the part of the latter.²

Another proof that the Spanish appeal was a struggle over the general principles of church discipline and that the particular circumstances of Basilides' fall were of little importance, is provided by the frequent references made in the epistle to the case of the second lapsed bishop, Martial. He did not go to Rome and thus could not have been judged and vindicated by St. Stephen; yet he also reclaimed his see.³ His case is the best proof of the absence of any legal element in the Spanish appeal. The Roman decision and the opinion of the Carthaginian Council were no more than brotherly advice sent to the Christians at Leon and Merida, who were free either to accept or to reject them. St. Cyprian's letter leaves no doubt that that was the nature of the so-called Spanish appeal. All his arguments deal, not with the right of the Roman bishop to restore Basilides and Martial,⁴ but with the heavy guilt that the Spanish Christians will incur if they follow Stephen's advice. "On which account people . . . ought to separate themselves from a sinful prelate . . . especially since they themselves have the power either of choosing worthy priests, or of rejecting unworthy ones," writes St. Cyprian to them.⁵ He uses all his eloquence, for he is convinced that his hearers are absolutely free to choose either of the rival bishops.

The Spanish appeal brings us straight to the baptismal controversy, the critical point of St. Stephen's episcopate. Its doctrinal side does not concern us at the moment; our object is to explain the breach of communion between Rome and Carthage. The question of whether or not heretics and schismatics could administer Christian baptism was hotly discussed

¹ Ep. 67 (9).

² Ep. 67 (5).

³ Ep. 67 (9).

⁴ Ep. 59 (14). "Everyone should be heard there where the crime has been committed."

⁵ Ep. 67 (3).

in all parts of the church in the third century, and the most divergent answers were given. St. Cyprian was the leading man in the controversy, and he upheld a most uncompromising position denying the validity of every baptism administered either by heretics or by schismatics. Although he was supported by the large majority of the African Christians nevertheless he had to face a strong opposition.¹ The main argument of the latter was that his view was not held by all the churches, and even that part of the Roman Church with which he was in communion recognised the heretical and schismatic baptisms. It was indeed the weakest point in St. Cyprian's clear and logical system. His theoretical arguments seemed to be irresistible² but his ecclesiastical policy contradicted all his principles, for he rejected Novatian, the Roman bishop who shared his view about baptism, and supported Cornelius and Stephen, his doctrinal opponents.

St. Cyprian tried, however, to solve this difficulty by insisting that the baptismal question, important as it was, was not yet finally settled by the whole church and that divergency of opinions was therefore possible.³

It is obvious that it was but a temporary and unsatisfactory compromise which could not last. The breach became inevitable when the part of the Roman congregation in communion with Africa added to the recognition of the heretical baptism the policy of restoring lapsed bishops to their previous offices. That was more than St. Cyprian could accept, and he held a synod in 256. A solemn deputation was sent to Rome, which requested Stephen in a brotherly manner to adopt the policy of the African churches, and to refuse further recognition of heretical and schismatic baptisms⁴ as well as to discontinue the restoration of lapsed clerics to their previous

¹ Ep. 71 (1-3). See also a treatise against St. Cyprian entitled "De Rebaptismate."

² Eps. 4 (4); 33 (1); 66 (8); 69 (1); 73 (21).

³ Eps. 69 (17); 72 (3); 73 (26).

⁴ Ep. 72 (1).

offices.¹ This epistle 72 is the opening of the drama and its contents, as well as its place in the collection of St. Cyprian's letters, makes it quite obvious that the initiative in the attack was on the part of St. Cyprian, and not of St. Stephen as is usually supposed.²

In order to understand St. Stephen's refusal to see the deputation and his threat to break off communion with Africa, we must imagine the impression which such an African intervention would produce upon the Roman Christians. Stephen's position was already difficult. He was attacked from several sides and it was a delicate task for him to defend the legitimacy of his episcopate in face of Novatian and other Christians criticising his policy. The arrival of the delegation from Africa put him in a serious quandary. His most prominent allies, the African bishops, led by a man of such world-wide repute as St. Cyprian, now demanded from him no less than a public renunciation of his policy and a solemn declaration that during the years of struggle it was Novatian who was doctrinally right and that he, Stephen, was wrong. It is most probable that St. Cyprian sincerely believed that even after such a declaration the Roman Christians would remain faithful to Stephen. Yet it is clear that in fact Stephen was placed in an impossible situation. If he declared that Novatian was right on the question of baptism he would inevitably lose his prestige among his flock and could hardly retain his see.

Thus St. Stephen was confronted by the following alternatives: should he accept the decision of the African synod and so ruin his career and endanger the life of the whole com-

¹ Ep. 72 (2).

² Batiffol, *Primitive Catholicism*, pp. 390. Abbe Turmel, *Hist. de Dogme de la Papauté*, 9. 176. Paris 1908. Puller, *The Primitive Saints*, 3rd edition, pp. 64-70. Benson, *Cyprian*, pp. 434-5. London 1897. E. Gaspar, *Geschichte de Papstums*, Vol. I, pp. 81-2. Tubingen 1930.

munity,¹ or should he reject it entirely. St. Stephen, unanimously supported by his community,² chose the second course. The way in which he expressed his disagreement bitterly hurt St. Cyprian. He refused to see the delegates of the African synod and ordered the doors of the churches and of the catholic houses to be shut in their faces. St. Stephen's conduct was explained by his adversaries as an expression either of his presumption and obstinacy³ or of his profound ignorance of doctrine.⁴ The fact was that Stephen was driven to this extreme measure by St. Cyprian's intervention.

This approach to the breach of communion between Rome and North Africa is consistent with the present order of St. Cyprian's epistles and explains the vagueness of St. Cyprian's expressions describing the motives of St. Stephen's action. If, on the contrary, we accept the traditional view, that it was Stephen who attacked St. Cyprian, and the rest of the north African bishops who tried to preserve their own traditions, then we must reverse the present order of St. Cyprian's epistles and presume the loss of a number of very important documents. This last point is clearly made by Hans von Soden in his book *Der Streit zwischen Rom und Carthage über die Ketzerstaufe*.⁵ He insisted that, if the traditional interpretation holds good, Epistle 72, the synodical epistle to Stephen, the most decisive document of the whole collection, cannot belong to the Sixth Carthaginian Council as

¹ In a place like Rome where there were so many various tendencies in the heterogeneous body of Christians, the introduction of rebaptism by the Catholics would undoubtedly be most dangerous, and reception by the imposition of the bishop's hand was the only possible method of dealing with the schismatics and heretics. *cf.* Hipp, *The Philosoph*, IX, 12.

² Ep. 75 (25) clearly implies that the Catholic Christians at Rome obeyed Stephen and that the African bishops could not find shelter and food among them.

³ Ep. 74 (11).

⁴ Ep. 75 (5-14).

⁵ Könl. Preuss. Hist. Institut in Rom XII. Rom 1909.

is usually accepted, but must be ascribed to the next, the Seventh Council; its place is therefore not at the beginning of the conflict but in its very last stage. It means that the present order of St. Cyprian's epistles is definitely misleading.

Hans Soden's main argument is that before the Seventh Council Stephen's epistle of rebuke to the Africans was already circulated in Africa, for Eps. 73 and 74, written before the Seventh Council, are Cyprian's indirect answers to this letter.¹ Soden, believing that Stephen was attacking Cyprian and the African churches, conjectures that Stephen's epistle must have been written before Epistle 72, which was the last act before the formal breach of communion between Rome and Africa. But the view that Epistle 72 was sent by the Seventh Council raises two difficulties: A. Epistle 72 contains two requests addressed to Stephen (i) to rebaptise the heretics and, (ii) to treat the lapsed clerics as laymen, whilst the Seventh Council dealt exclusively with the first question, as we know from its minutes (only one bishop, Novatus of Thamugada, mentions the second question). B. The second difficulty is that Epistle 72 contains no reference to Stephen's requests that the African churches should abandon their local tradition. Soden is aware of these objections but his attempt to meet them is not convincing.²

These difficulties fall to the ground, however, if we accept the fact that Cyprian first attacked Stephen. In this case it would be quite natural that Stephen, after he had refused to communicate with the envoys from the Sixth Council should send a letter to Africa explaining the reason for his conduct. This letter, which is lost at present, is mentioned in Epistles 73, 74 and 75, but it was never answered, either by St. Cyprian or by the Carthaginian Council, and the minutes of the next, seventh, Council do not contain any direct reference to it. Thus the present order of St. Cyprian's letters corresponds to the chronology of the conflict, and all that needs explanation

¹ *op. cit.* p. 16.

² I *op. cit.* pp. 21-25.

is St. Cyprian's failure to answer St. Stephen directly. This was, however, the consequence of St. Cyprian's general policy, which was to avoid any precise definition of the circumstances of his conflict with St. Stephen.

St. Cyprian, though most eloquent in his arguments as to the doctrinal issues involved in the baptismal controversy, is always reserved as to the actual facts, and never tells why St. Stephen threatened to suspend the communion between Rome and North Africa. His silence is undoubtedly a main cause of the difficulty in interpreting the controversy. Most probably the key to the riddle is to be found in the peculiarity of St. Cyprian's doctrinal position. As we know, he dedicated his whole life to one single purpose, namely, the search for an institution which could provide the church with an effective weapon against the spirit of disorder and disobedience. St. Cyprian eventually found this institution in the body which he described as the college of the universal episcopate. This college of bishops was founded, as he believed, by God himself,¹ and it was endowed with a special grace for keeping intact the unity and order of the church.² He believed also that "the charity of spirit, the honour of our college (of the bishops), the bond of faith and priestly concord must be maintained by us with patience and gentleness,"³ for these qualities were to his mind the mark of the special charisma which each bishop had to possess, and only so long as he preserved it could a prelate be considered as a shepherd really elected by God, a true member of the episcopal college. St. Cyprian was constantly engaged in conflict, for he believed that the preservation of the order and unity of the church is commissioned by God to the body of bishops. Yet his idea was that all the bishops occupied Peter's chair, and were equal,⁴ and respon-

¹ Eps. 3 (3); 33 (1); 45 (3); 66 (4).

² Eps. 48 (3); 52 (2).

³ Ep. 73 (26).

⁴ Eps. 33 (1); 43 (5); 48 (4); 55 (8-12); 59 (5-14); 66 (9); 69 (17); 70 (3); 72 (3); 73 (7-26).

sible to God alone.¹ It is not through command but through brotherly love and persuasion that they must help one another and rule the church.² It was in this spirit that he intervened in the life of the Roman Church³ but his motives were entirely misunderstood by St. Stephen, who without entering into the discussion suspended his communion with the bishops sent by the African churches and thus openly demonstrated his lack of love and forbearance as well as his unfamiliarity with the doctrines to which St. Cyprian devoted his life. St. Stephen's reaction to the interference from Africa destroyed St. Cyprian's beloved vision of the universal episcopate as the body which had received from God a commission to keep the unity of the church intact. The extreme anxiety which he so openly displayed after Stephen's refusal to maintain communion with the African bishops, has often been explained as a proof of St. Cyprian's belief that Rome was the centre of church unity.⁴ It followed from this interpretation that St. Cyprian had decided to preserve communion with the Roman see at any

¹ Eps. 62 (17) ; 73 (3) ; 73 (26).

² Eps. 55 (24) ; 66 (8) ; 68 (5).

³ "We have brought these things, dearest brother, to your knowledge both for the sake of our common honour and for sincere affection : believing that to you too according to the truth of your piety and faith, those things are pleasing which are alike pious and true. But we know that some are unwilling to lay aside what they have once imbibed, or easily change their mind, instead of retaining together with the bond of peace and concord with colleagues unimpaired certain special usages which have once come to prevail amongst themselves. In which case we neither do violence to nor impose a law upon any one, since each prelate has in the administration of the Church free exercise of his will, as he shall give an account of his conduct to the Lord." Ep. 72. From this passage it is evident that St. Cyprian had for some time been opposed to the Roman practice and had already experienced Stephen's opposition (probably in the Gaulish and Spanish appeals). At first he felt that these errors must be tolerated ; but when the scandal became apparent, he decided that the time had come when the other bishops must raise their voices to correct their colleague Stephen.

⁴ Chapman, *Prof. Koch on St. Cyprian*, pp. 457-6 (Rev. Bened. Oct. 1910).

price, since he was aware that separation from Rome meant separation from the church.¹

His assertion that bishops could differ² on a question of such primary importance as the validity of heretical baptisms was also understood in the same sense. Such an attitude appeared even more inconsistent when compared with his policy during the conflict at Arles. Then he had insisted on the severe punishment of Marcianus, who had dared to disagree with the other bishops; now he accepted without scruple a divergency on a far more important matter.³

The position of St. Cyprian was indeed tragic, but it was the result of the fact that his conflict with Stephen was a denial of his whole doctrine of the universal episcopate as the guardian of church unity. He had to accept the fact that a lawful bishop of the greatest church could err and could lack that spirit of love and concord which was, in his view, the very essence of the episcopal office.⁴ If this picture of St. Cyprian's state of mind is true, it explains why, although he complains bitterly of St. Stephen's conduct, he never gives the reason for the breach of communion. For he could not but see that every further discussion of the subject must reveal the failure of his conception of church unity.

St. Stephen's act of hostility was probably one of the most severe among many disappointments which St. Cyprian suffered at the end of his life. But he had to undergo even another and more humiliating trial at the Seventh Council of Carthage, the last of his life. St. Stephen's interpretation of St. Cyprian's brotherly advice as an unlawful intrusion into the life of another community probably found a whole-hearted response among those African Christians who were in opposition to the great bishop of Carthage.⁵ There were

¹ Duchesne, *Early Hist.* Vol. I, p. 426.

² St. Cyprian's declaration at the Seventh Council of Carthage, and in Ep. 69 (17) ; 72 (3) ; 73 (26).

³ Batiffol, *Prim Cathol.* p. 388.

⁴ Eps. 55 (24) ; 66 (8).

⁵ Eps. 72 (1-2) ; 73 (26). *De Rebaptismate* (1, 10).

accusations that St. Cyprian desired, and intended, to establish a suzerainty over the other bishops, and the author of the doctrine of episcopal equality had publicly to refute the charge of making himself the "bishop of bishops." This famous expression, used by St. Cyprian in his opening speech at the Seventh Council of Carthage, was commonly interpreted as another proof of St. Stephen's aggressiveness, and as unquestionable evidence that the papal claims already existed in the middle of the third century.¹

Yet it is hardly possible that it could have such a meaning in the mouth of the speaker, and there are reasons for believing that St. Cyprian's words referred primarily to himself. After a reference to Bishop Jubaianus' letter, St. Cyprian asks the bishops gathered from various parts of Africa to express frankly their opinions concerning the baptisms of heretics. He says: "It remains that upon this very matter we should severally bring forward what we think, judging no man, nor removing anyone from the right of communion, if he should think differently from us." Proceeding further, he goes on: "For neither does anyone of us set himself up as a bishop of bishops . . ."² It is obvious that St. Cyprian was afraid that the bishops would not be quite frank, and that rumours had spread before

¹ This opinion was held by Archbishop Benson (*Cyprian* p. 370), who writes: "Obviously St. Cyprian . . . is alluding to St. Stephen's haughty attitude and to his threats of excommunication"; the same opinion is expressed by Puller, *The Primitive Saints*, p. 65; Kidd, *History of the Church*, Vol. I, p. 469; Caspar, *Gesch. des Papsttums*, p. 81; Koch, *Cathedra Petri*, p. 179. It is very curious that only some extreme controversialists on the Roman side tried to interpret the statement differently, their reason being that they wished to make the conflict between St. Cyprian and Pope Stephen appear less acute, since it was incompatible with the high veneration in which the great bishop of Carthage was held by the Roman Catholic Church. These attempts were made by Abbe Freppel, *St. Cyprian* (Paris 1865), p. 425; and by Dr. Peters, *Die Lehre des Hl. Cyprian*, 1870, pp. 515-516. But they were vehemently opposed by other scholars, i.e. Benson, *op. cit.* (p. 370) n. 2, and Puller, *op. cit.*, pp. 72-77.

² Migne, *P.L.*, III, 1002; Hartel, *Pars. I*, p. 436.

the opening of the Council that the prelates gathered there would be terrorised by someone who claimed to be bishop of bishops. The question then arises who this person could be.

It seems that the generally accepted theory that it was St. Stephen is hardly tenable for the following reasons:

(a) Stephen was obviously unable to punish individually the bishops gathered at Carthage. Thus there was no reason for any bishop to be afraid to say what he thought.

(b) If it was Stephen whom St. Cyprian had in mind, then it is almost incredible that a general discussion of the relation between Rome and Africa did not take place at the Council and that Cyprian did not mention the Roman bishop by name. On the contrary there is plenty of evidence that Cyprian deliberately avoided any discussion of this side of the controversy. The Council dealt exclusively with the baptism of heretics, which was a local African problem, and the treatment of the lapsed clerics, which was a point of contention between Rome and Africa, was not discussed. This policy was the natural outcome of the offence which Cyprian took at Stephen's rejection of the brotherly intervention of the preceding Council, and the African bishops obviously decided to ignore the Roman bishop as long as Stephen continued to disregard the honour and unity of the episcopal college.

These considerations lead us to the conclusion that this sentence can only refer to St. Cyprian himself. It was he and not Stephen who had been accused of making himself the bishop of bishops,¹ and he feared that his colleagues would for that reason feel themselves unable to voice their true convictions in his presence. There is indeed plenty of evidence to prove that St. Cyprian had real reasons for admonishing his colleagues to speak without fear. One was that the Church

¹ In his refutation of this charge Cyprian possibly had in mind the rude conduct of his Roman colleagues and this gave a special power to his ardent defence against the incriminations launched by his enemies.

of Carthage, under St. Cyprian's government, was full of care for other communities, and helped them magnanimously in times of distress.¹ A breach of communion with this rich and influential church would mean a great deal to other African congregations, and the bishop who had provoked it might easily be dismissed by his people.² Another reason was that St. Cyprian was the presiding bishop of the Council and all the others were his guests, who received their communion from his hands. His words about "not rejecting anyone from the right of communion" had a very concrete meaning if applied to him.

Moreover, St. Cyprian's constant and active intervention in the affairs of other churches, both in Africa and abroad, gave his opponents good ground for accusing him of seeking to make himself bishop of bishops.³ The opening of the conciliar debates was, therefore, a most opportune moment for his solemn declaration that "every bishop can no more be judged by another than he himself can judge another."

A final proof that it was to himself that St. Cyprian was referring at the opening of the Seventh Council, can be found in a comparison of this speech with three other quotations from his epistles, related to the same controversy, in all of which St. Cyprian used much the same words to refute the same charge that he had tried to force other bishops to accept his opinion.⁴ It is quite improbable that St. Cyprian would

¹ Eps. 2 (7) ; 62 ; 76 ; 77 ; 79.

² The African communities depended in many respects on Carthage. This dependence was not only spiritual, but was largely due to the material help which they received from there, and it gave great, though informal power, to the bishop of Carthage. Especially instructive is the story of an actor related in Ep. 2 whom the Carthage community consented to support materially, since this was beyond the power of his own Church.

³ The local African opposition to St. Cyprian was very strong. *De Rebapt.* 1-10 ; Ep. 71 (1-2).

⁴ The same conviction was expressed by St. Cyprian during the conflict provoked by the unlawful ordination of Novatian, see Ep. 55 (21).

suddenly apply to his opponent Stephen the almost identical phrases that he had already on three occasions used of himself. A comparison of the texts clearly reveals their analogy.¹ The only words which do not appear in the three quotations from the epistles are "a bishop of bishops," but they would have been as out of place there as they were suitable at the opening of the Council. However, their absence in no way detracts from the similarity of meaning between all these texts.

The interpretation of Cyprian's words suggested in this essay must considerably affect the traditional view of Stephen's policy as one of papal aggression. To later historians it seemed axiomatic that only the bishop of Rome should claim authority over other bishops, and they were not prepared to admit that the bishop of Carthage might attack, and the bishop of Rome defend, the peculiar traditions of a local church. But analysis of the conflicts in which St. Stephen took an active part sheds an entirely new light on the role that he played.

Before an account of Stephen's policy can be attempted we must return to Firmilian's letter and to the question, raised at the beginning of this article, of the reason for the violence

¹ (a). Epistle 69 (17), to Magnus: ". . . prescribing to no one so as to prevent any prelate from determining what he thinks right, as he shall give an account of his own doing to the Lord."

(b) Epistle 72 (3), to Stephen: "In which behalf we neither do violence to nor impose a law upon anyone, since each prelate has in the administration of the Church the free exercise of his will, as he shall give an account of his conduct to the Lord."

(c) Epistle 73 (26), to Jobaianus: "I have briefly written to you . . . prescribing to none and prejudging none, so as to prevent any one of the bishops doing what he thinks well, and having the free exercise of his judgement."

(d) Seventh Council: "It remains that upon this same matter we should severally bring forward what we think, judging no man nor rejecting anyone from the right of communion if he should think differently from us."

"For neither does any of us set himself as a bishop of bishops, nor by tyrannical terror does any compel his colleagues to the necessity of obedience."

"But let us all wait for the judgement of our Lord Jesus Christ."

of Firmilian's attitude towards the conflict between Stephen and the North African bishops.

This point has, as far as I know, never been discussed, although it presents a real problem, for in the abuse and invective which Firmilian heaps upon Stephen there is a note of personal bitterness which must be due to something more than mere sympathy with the unjustly treated bishops of the remote North African churches. Yet this letter has become the chief source of the belief in Stephen's aggressiveness, and the famous expression of "excommunication" is found only in this document. The well-known passage runs as follows: "For what strife and dissensions have you stirred up throughout the churches of the whole world. Moreover how great sin have you heaped up for yourself, when you cut yourself off from so many flocks: for it is yourself that you have cut off. Do not deceive yourself, since he is really the schismatic who had made himself an apostate from the communion of ecclesiastical unity. For while you think that all may be excommunicated by you, you have excommunicated yourself from all."¹

These words have usually been taken in their literal sense and the justice of Firmilian's censure has seldom been questioned. While it was believed that the sole purpose of St. Stephen's policy was to impose the Roman practice upon the other churches, Firmilian's words, as those of one of Stephen's numerous victims, appeared to be of a great objective value. Their reliability, however, becomes very questionable when the cause of the conflict between Stephen and Firmilian is taken into consideration and when Firmilian is understood to be the defeated aggressor. The whole tenour of this letter suggests that Firmilian's intention is to incriminate Stephen and to lay all the onus upon him. His letter is typical of one who refuses to acknowledge his own responsibility for the conflict and tries to discredit his adversary by attributing to him the most extreme precautions. It is only thus that it is possible to understand the exclamation of Firmilian: "for while you think that all

¹ Ep. 75 (24).

may be excommunicated by you, you have excommunicated yourself from all."

This bitterness and excitement were the results of the uncomfortable position in which Firmilian and the other Eastern bishops were caught. They made a vain attempt to cure the Novatian schism¹ and not only did they fail in this but were induced to submit to Stephen, the man whose doctrines they could not approve and whose personal character they profoundly disliked.

In order fully to understand Firmilian's psychology and the reason for his deep concern with the conflict between Stephen and Cyprian, we must explain how Stephen could so successfully defend his position and why his numerous adversaries were obliged to yield. It is quite evident that it was not in the field of theology that Stephen could obtain his victory, for undoubtedly both St. Cyprian² and Firmilian³ were indignant at the poverty of Stephen's doctrinal arguments;⁴ it

¹ This approach to the conflict between Rome and Asia explains why neither St. Cyprian nor Firmilian make full use of the fact that Stephen quarrelled both with the East and with the South. The reason is that the causes of the two conflicts were entirely different. The policy of the Eastern bishops in recognising Novatian was absolutely unacceptable to St. Cyprian, for whom Novatian was an enemy of the Church with whom no negotiations were possible. Thus St. Cyprian and Firmilian had one point in common, their disapproval of Stephen, but they were entirely opposed to one another in their attitude towards Novatian and his claims to the see of Rome. Naturally, therefore, their temporary alliance contained many points of ambiguity which affect Firmilian's epistle. He supports Cyprian wholeheartedly, but merely by a repetition of the latter's words, for if he had used the arguments of his previous conflict with Stephen he and Cyprian would immediately have found themselves in opposite camps.

² Ep. 74 (4).

³ Eps. 75 (5-14).

⁴ St. Stephen wrote to the African Christians: "If anyone therefore come to you from a heresy whatever let nothing be innovated which has not been handed down to wit, that hands be imposed on him for repentance, since the heretics themselves in

was also not the authority of the chair of Peter which made Stephen invincible for Firmilian at least had but little respect for it.¹ The real source of Stephen's power seems to lie in the special economic advantages of the Roman community, which placed it above all other churches. "The early church," as Mgr. Batiffor writes, "was a social brotherhood securing its members from misery and neglect."² It was composed of large and small, rich and poor local communities. The Roman community held the position of a mother church in this numerous family.³ Christians from all parts of the world came on their various business to Rome, where they were welcome guests of the Roman brothers. In time of distress they appealed to Rome and received thence help and protection. Dionysius of Corinth already mentions the rich alms received everywhere from Rome.⁴ Dionysius of Alexandria speaks of the same thing;⁵ and Basil the Great also described the assistance which the Church of Cappadocia received from Rome in the year 259⁶ at the time of Dionysius' pontificate.

St. Stephen seems to be the first pope who realised the tremendous power which belonged to the Roman community

¹ Firmilian writes: "But that they who are at Rome . . . vainly pretend the authority of the Apostles." Ep. 75 (6).

² *Primit. Cath.*, p. 341.

³ The effective organisation of charity, and the amount of money spent on it by the Roman Church in spite of persecution and division can be deduced from Cornelius' letter to Fabian of Antioch. Cornelius mentions in it 1,500 widows and other persons in distress regularly supported by the Roman Church. Eus. H.E., VI., 43. (ii).

⁴ Eus. H.E. IV, 23. (10)

⁵ Eus. H.E., VII, 5 (2).

⁶ Basil. Ep. LXX. Migne, P.G. t. XXXII, col. 434-35.

their own proper character do not baptize such as come to them from one another, but only admit them to communion." It was a piece of bad Latin as well as of bad theology, but it was the most expedient method in view of the peculiar conditions in Rome. Stephen's description of the practice of his community coincides strikingly with the picture drawn by Hippolytus, *c.f.* Philos. B IX, ch. 12, pp. 443-4.

by virtue of the material dependence on her of the other churches. He was also the first to use this power against doctrinal opponents whose arguments he was unable to refute, and whose practical proposals he could not accept. He refused hospitality to the African bishops sent by the Carthaginian synod in order to punish them for their intervention in the Roman conflict, and thus all the Catholic Christians from North Africa who were accustomed to stay in Christian homes during their frequent visits to Rome, were deprived of this expression of Christian unity and mutual help. The Asiatics, as a consequence of their disagreement with Stephen, would suffer in the same way, and also in times of destitution they would not be able to obtain their customary assistance from Rome. It is most probable that the Asiatic bishops were induced to submit just on this ground and the humiliating nature of their defeat made Firmilian's letter so especially bitter.¹

At this point we may attempt to restore the general lines of Stephen's policy during his short but stormy episcopate. It appears now to be free from any internal contradictions and on the contrary to be consistent throughout. St. Stephen was a man of very determined and independent character, possessing a rare gift of understanding the needs of his time. In his resolute pursuit of the urgently needed reforms, he was not afraid of breaking with the traditions of the past, he had no fear of the opposition of other churches, and he was ready to use the most drastic measures against their attempts to control the Roman Christians. This view of St. Stephen is supported by all the scattered facts which we possess. He starts his episcopate in the face of the opposition of the Eastern churches, but he very soon forces them to make peace with him. He achieves this by threatening the East with suspension of communion, and with all the material and spiritual consequences involved in it. He refuses to intervene in the internal troubles

¹ This suggestion is supported by the fact that Dionysius, in the same letter, mentions both the restoration of peace between Stephen and the other Churches, and the help received by the latter from Rome. *Eus. H.E.*, VII, 5 (1-2).

in Arles, but he is quite ready to commune with Basilides who came from Spain to Rome with this special purpose in view and he treats him in the same way as the other lapsed clerics from Rome and neighbouring Italian cities. He resolutely rejects the attempt of the African bishops, led by St. Cyprian, to impose their own traditions upon the Roman community and he defends his position not so much by arguments as by quick and effective action. He was undoubtedly one of the most distinguished bishops of Rome during the first centuries, and his real genius was displayed in a skilful administration of the Roman community. This task was infinitely more difficult than that of any other bishop, a fact that was underestimated, both by his colleagues and by later church historians.

Few events in church history have been more misunderstood than the baptismal controversy, and in particular the breach of communion between Rome, and Asia and Africa. It has always been considered that this was caused by an arrogant attempt on the part of Stephen to impose the Roman custom upon the other churches, and by his desire to correct their doctrinal errors, even at the price of excommunication.¹ In reality it was the outcome of a determined defence by the Roman community of its own particular traditions against the attacks which for different reasons both St. Cyprian and the Eastern bishops made on it. St. Stephen had no power to excommunicate the other churches and deprive them of their membership of Christ's body, but he could refuse communion to such Christian visitors in Rome as insisted that Novatian and not he was following the true doctrine.

The struggle between Cyprian and Stephen might have had momentous consequences for the further development of the church; but it was brought to an abrupt end by Stephen's

¹ Mgr. Batiffol gives the following description of St. Stephen's excommunication of the Asiatic and African Churches: "Pope Stephen affirmed the primacy of the see of Rome, a primacy dating back to St. Peter and giving to the bishop of Rome a right over the other bishops of the Christian world." *Primit. Cathol.* p. 390.

death in August 257. This event was followed by St. Cyprian's arrest and martyrdom in September 258. After St. Cyprian's death there was no one to continue his ardent campaign against the Roman tradition. The Church of Rome, feeling herself again in a safe position, restored her communion with the other churches and began once more to send rich alms to Asia, although she continued to preserve her own tradition, with its fundamental difference from that of the other churches.

N. ZERNOV.

CHURCHES OF EUROPE: CHURCH CRISIS IN GERMANY.

THE situation in Germany has turned the eyes of the whole world upon her. The crisis through which she has passed, and is passing, in the political sphere has had its reaction upon every walk of life. The rise to power of Herr Hitler and his followers has been one of the surprising events of the post-war period. If one tries to understand this complete turnover of a whole people, previously divided into almost innumerable party factions, one is faced at the outset with great difficulties. It has been said by a prominent member from among Herr Hitler's followers that even they themselves find the causes of the growth of the movement difficult of explanation. It is reasonable to think that Hitler saw his opportunity in the very weakness which was caused by the existence of so many political parties, and saw moreover that if he could offer a definite policy which would attract by its idealism the minds of the people, he would have a very good chance of being returned to power.

The German nation was feeling more keenly perhaps than is usually realized the burdens imposed upon them by the Treaty of Versailles and the various arrangements which had been accepted from time to time as a means of meeting the obligations of that treaty. They resented the feeling that other nations were regarding Germany as a second-class power, and the feeling was growing that, while Germany was ready to discuss proposals for the general good of the world at large she was not prepared to treat on any terms other than those of equality in the councils of the nations. Hence it was that, when his opportunity arose and Herr Hitler offered himself and his party, the "Nationalsozialistische Deutsche Arbeiterpartei" (Nazi), for election, the nation at large had the feeling that here at any rate was a man who knew his own mind, had suffered for his conviction and whose policy after all might be the means of uniting their country. The story of Hitler's triumphal

passage from obscurity to the position of Reichskanzler has passed into history. It is not the purpose of the present article to deal with the political side of things. In view, however, of the close connection between the causes of the present crisis of the Church in Germany and the political situation, it was necessary to touch on the growth of the Nazi principle in Germany. For, as will be shown, one at least of the causes of the crisis of the church life of Germany is to be found in this very spread of the National Socialistic ideas.

If we are to understand the events which have taken place in this year in the church life of Germany, we must go back a little into the past. First of all a very common mistake about the German Church must be corrected. From the name of the great reformer Luther the title of Lutheran has been commonly given to the German Church. Now while this may be correct to a certain extent, the use of the word conveys a false picture. The church in Germany was not one, nor was it true to say that it was all Lutheran. There were parts of the church which were more under the influence of Zwingli, and others which had modelled themselves on the teaching of Calvin. Thus it came about that when the work of the reformers was done and the new church established, it was not as a united whole that it was established, but as separate entities in each of the divisions or principalities of Germany. The churches then founded were known as "Landeskirchen" and each Landeskirche was allowed to retain in its constitution its own particular theological colour as well as its own national characteristics. So wide were the diversities between these Landeskirchen that they were not all of necessity in communion with each other. Each had its own governing body and its own presiding ecclesiastical dignitaries. Each made regulations for the ordering of its own church life for itself without there being any central governing body even of an advisory nature. It must be obvious that under such conditions the work of the church in Germany was difficult and hampered at every turn. Steps had been taken to bring about a measure of unity in the appointment of a body called the Kirchentag which was to meet annually at Eisenach. In connection with this there were to be a "Kirchenausschuss" and a "Kirchenbund" (church council and church synod). On these bodies

were to sit representatives of the various Landeskirchen, of which throughout Germany there were twenty-eight. Their functions were purely of an advisory nature and they had no judicial power. They had already for some years, when the present political crisis arose, been engaged upon the drawing up of a scheme for the unification of the church in Germany and a new constitution. The work was one of great difficulty and was proceeding very slowly. It may easily be imagined that when the representatives of the twenty-eight Landeskirchen sought to find a working basis for unification there were a multitude of points arising, many of them of a doctrinal nature, and others which touched national customs and characteristics. The task before them was not one simple of solution. There was behind them no body with sufficient authority to enforce agreement, even if an enforced agreement on doctrinal matters were a desirable thing. However, the work was progressing and doubtless would have been brought to a satisfactory conclusion in the end. Meanwhile however the country had passed through the throes of that election which returned Hitler and the Nazi party to power, and the general movement for "Gleichschaltung" (unification) was being enforced in all activities in the country. The ideals of the Nazi party were disseminated forcefully, cleverly, even cunningly, through the whole country. The German revolution was a fact. It had apparently come to stay. Hitler was a popular idol; his word was law, and it seemed that his wishes were the wishes of the German people. There was of course a painful side to all this. It is impossible to let loose feelings such as those which were in the mind of Hitler's followers without running a risk. If in addition power and the heavy club are in the hands of those followers, and if it be remembered that they and their party had suffered much in the past, it is not surprising that acts of violence occurred. Nor is it surprising that with their eyes turning this way and that to find further means of propaganda and other fields of unification they should have turned to the church as a tremendous help in this direction. But she must be united. The position of the church at this point, in April of 1933, was that the work on the new constitution had reached a state where it had been handed over to a committee of three, appointed by the Kirchenbund, for them to work out its final form. At the end of May at a conference at Loccum

the constitution was finally agreed upon, and the first Reichsbishop elected. The person chosen was von Bodelschwingh, a prominent figure in church life in Germany. Von Bodelschwingh had founded and brought to wonderful activity at Bielefeld in Westphalia a colony for destitute people which had also a branch colony near Berlin. He was a man of great personality and piety, a tremendous worker and bore a name well known before his own work had shed added lustre upon it. But alas he was not a fighter in the arena of political things. Generalsuperintendent Kapler who had been President of the Council of Three whose final work was finished with the election of a Reichsbishop handed in his resignation. On the 21st of June the Church Synod in Eisenach appointed a successor to Kapler as its President, Stoltenhof. The government claimed that this appointment had been made without its sanction and that therefore the concordat between the Church and State had been broken and that the State must step in. Accordingly on the 24th of June Dr. Jaeger, a layman, was appointed commissar for the Church in Prussia. He proceeded to appoint commissars for other Landeskirchen, to dismiss certain of the clergy, and to confiscate certain church property. Considerable feeling was aroused throughout the country by this action and letters were written to the President bringing the state of affairs to his notice. On the 29th of June an interview took place between the President and Hitler at which the President expressed his anxiety for the freedom of the church. Hitler as a result instructed Frick, the Minister of the Interior, to take action. Frick appointed a committee to draw up a new constitution. As president of this committee Ludwig Muller was nominated. Muller had stood against Bodelschwingh at the previous election for the Reichsbishop but had been defeated. He was a personal friend of the Reichskanzler. An army chaplain at Koenigsberg, he had befriended Hitler during his bad time when everyone's hand was against him, when his followers were few, and he sometimes went in danger of his life. Muller had taken him in to his own house in Koenigsberg and a close friendship had arisen between the two men. It was well known that the election of Muller to the Reichsbishopric would be pleasing to Hitler. Bodelschwingh after a very brief tenure of office had resigned and returned to his humanitarian work. On the 14th of July

the new constitution completed by Muller and his committee was published and made law by the Reichstag. According to the constitution there was to be a new election to fill all those offices the holders of which had been dismissed by the commissar. Commissars were withdrawn, the State pronouncing that the church was now free to put its own house in order and to work out its future on the lines laid down in the new constitution. The preliminary step to be taken before any constructive work could begin was the election by the parishes of their parish councils. From these parish councils representatives were to be sent to the General Synod of each Landeskirche. From these Landessynods a National Synod was to be elected. The first duty of the National Synod when it assembled was to be the election of a Reichsbishop who should then proceed to a point, a Spiritual Council (*geistliches Ministerium*) which was to be the executive of the church thus united. This Spiritual Council was to consist of four members with the Reichsbishop, three clerical and one lay member. The stage was set. Everything looked easy. The issue seemed straightforward. But in the event it proved to be far from the simple problem it had first appeared. It was at this point that the principles of the Nazi State, and the influence of the Nazi propaganda began to make themselves felt not only on the legal side of church life, that they had already done, but on the personal life of church people. In any election in Germany the elector is not asked to vote for a person but for a party. So many votes cast for a party entitle that party to a certain number of seats. Now in church affairs the influence of the Nazi idea had brought into being a body known as the "Deutsche Christen" or German Christians. The beliefs of this body were viewed with distrust by the more conservative members of the German Church. There were fears expressed that they had derived some of their tenets from an old sect known as the "Deutsche Kirche" or Germanic Church which in its turn was much imbued with the pagan ideas put forward by Ludendorff and his followers. Ludendorff had sought to place the old nordic legions of mythology on a level with Christianity. They emphasized the heroic ideal of paganism and minimized the idea of dependence on the Grace of God and the need of the Atonement. The Deutsche Christen party had considerable government support. The

more conservative elements who stood for the faith of the church put out for the election a party calling itself "Evangelische Kirche" or Evangelical Church. The power of the Deutsche Christen made itself felt at this early stage in an order which was issued forbidding the use of the name "Evangelical Church" as applied to a party. This was on the eve of the election and all that could be done was to change the name to "Evangelium und Kirche" or "Gospel and Church." This party worked under enormous disabilities. It seemed to be against the government and consequently came under the government's displeasure. It was not allowed to hold meetings, it was not allowed to post notices, while the other side, the Deutsche Christen, made full use of meetings and propaganda of all sorts. All members of the Nazi party were instructed by their local political organisations to enrol themselves on the voting lists of their parish, and thousands who had either never or at any rate not for many years ever been near a church came forward and made use of their legal right to vote in the parish. The result was a foregone conclusion. It was quite obvious the election must result in an overwhelming Deutsche Christen majority. Indeed so obvious was this, that in order to obtain some small measure of representation most parishes agreed to a proportional representation of 80 per cent. Deutsche Christen and 20 per cent. Evangelium und Kirche. The lists were thus said to be unified, and no voting was necessary. The result was as foreseen. Practically throughout Germany there was a Deutsche Christen representation on the parish councils of at least 80 per cent., and in Westphalia alone was there a majority for the Evangelium und Kirche.

This proportion gave a representation of the new party, the Deutsche Christen, which was by no means a true picture of the religious feeling of Germany. Practically everywhere those who were really earnest Christians felt that the new Councils of the church would represent far more the political than the religious feeling of the country.

The new constitution had laid down that in the National Synod there were to be sixty-six members, two-thirds of these from Prussia and one-third from the other churches outside Prussia. It is important to remember the constitution of this Synod since the majority of seats being in the hands of Prussia

the decision of the Landes Synod of Prussia were bound to have very great weight. A feeling of great anxiety continued to spread. The next step was to be the election and meeting of the Landes Synods. In preparation for this the Deutsche Christen started a campaign of active propaganda. They held meetings, circularised the parishes, and endeavoured in every way to draw in more and more active members of their party. Clergymen who were not members of the party received letters demanding their resignation, and when they endeavoured to hold meetings of their people they met with active opposition. There are two authenticated stories in this connection which well illustrate the attitude and tactics of the Deutsche Christen on the one hand, and the difficulties which faced the Evangelium Party (the conservative element) on the other.

In a parish in the north of Berlin the parish pastor, a member of the Evangelium Party, had called his faithful people together to speak to them about the new constitution and the faith of the church. On his way from his house to the parish hall, he was waylaid by a party of S.A. men (the S.A. men are the political troops of the Nazi movement) who marched him round the streets of his parish while another party introduced a Deutsche Christen pastor to the meeting, and held the doors closed while he addressed the assembled parishioners. At the conclusion of the meeting the doors were thrown open, the people allowed to depart, and the parish pastor was released and allowed to return home.

The other instance occurred in Potsdam. In the general unification of all branches of activity, the youth movements in Germany had been brought into one and placed under a Fuehrer or leader in the person of Baldur von Schirach, whose name at any rate was enough to fire the imagination of the youth he was expected to lead. The experiment was tried of appointing youthful lay commissars to organize and run these movements in each district. There was in one of the churches in Potsdam a very well known and largely attended children's service. The newly-appointed commissar went to the parish pastor and informed him that it would be no longer necessary for him to take the service, as he proposed to take it himself in future.

These two examples which might be multiplied indefinitely, serve to show the disabilities under which the Evangelium Party were working.

It must not be imagined that the proposals of the Deutsche Christen were entirely destructive. On the surface there was a great deal that was very excellent. In the forefront of their plan was the evangelization of Germany. They felt, and not without justification, that the church in the post-War years had been losing its hold on the people. They advocated an intensive missionary effort to bring the Gospel message into every German home. This proposal was obviously beyond criticism. And it was only when examination was made of the kind of Gospel message that they wished to convey, and the methods by which they wished to convey it, that the underlying dangers of the Deutsche Christen movement became clear.

The next step was the assembly of the Landes Synod in Prussia, the most important of all the Landes Synods. Two important measures were approved at this Synod. The first introduced the title of Bishop and divided Prussia into ten diocesan Bishoprics. The two most important appointments were those of Muller as Landesbishop for Prussia and Hossenfelder as Bishop of Brandenburg. Hossenfelder had come into prominence on the political wave. He was a man of no ecclesiastical importance and with little ecclesiastical experience. He was the leader of the Deutsche Christen, a man of violent and extreme views, and generally considered dangerous. Subsequent events proved this estimation of his character to have been correct.

The second measure that was introduced came as a bombshell to a large number of those present. It was what has become known as the Aryan Clause. The proposal was put forward in the Synod that the church should accept for her officials the same regulations as had been laid down by the State for the officials of the State;—that no one who was not of pure Aryan blood could hold office;—furthermore that those who were married to persons of non-Aryan descent were debarred from being ordained or holding office in the church. The introduction of this proposal came as a complete surprise to the members of the Evangelium Party in the Synod. They

had had no time to discuss any possible concerted action and were at a loss what to do. The spokesman of the Evangelium Party protested. His speech was interrupted and he was unable to complete his protests. He did, however, say that the Party which he represented had hoped that the Aryan Clause would have been dropped, and emphasized that its passing would be a violation of the third Article of the Confession of Faith. When he could proceed no further the whole party left the assembly. The election to the National Synod then took place. It was claimed that, as the Evangelium und Kirche Party had left, this placed the whole of the seats in the hands of the Deutsche Christen. The Synod accordingly nominated their nineteen delegates to the National Synod from the Deutsche Christen party.

The other Landes Synods had also met and accepted the title of Bishop, but had not passed the Aryan Clause. There was, with the one exception of Westphalia, an overwhelming Deutsche Christen representation returned for the National Synod.

September 27th saw the final stage reached in the setting up of the framework of the new church in Germany. The place was Wittenberg, the city of Luther. There, the procession of clergy and laity who had been returned as members of the National Synod passed through the bronze doors into the church where Luther had spoken—those doors, upon which are now engraved the Theses which Luther had nailed to the wooden doors which were their predecessors. After a short service the procession was re-formed and walked through the decorated streets of the town to the Town Church where Luther had so often spoken, and where the opening meeting of the National Synod was to be held. Here Muller and the three who had been associated with him in the work of drawing up the new constitution gave an account of their work, and, that work now being ended, laid down their office. The Synod reassembled in the evening and proceeded to the election of the first Reichsbishop. Ludwig Muller was unanimously chosen and he solemnly accepted the office. He then proceeded as his first duty according to the Constitution to appoint his Spiritual Council of which Hossenfelder was appointed chairman. The new Reichsbishop gave an address from the steps

of the altar, calling upon all present to go forth and join in the fight for the evangelization of Germany. His words were impressive and earnest, and one felt that the opportunity and the will were there, but the absence of every personality hitherto well known in the church world of Germany from that meeting of the National Synod made one realize that there were dangers ahead. Outwardly all seemed well and probably few who were present at Wittenberg realized that the gauntlet had already been thrown down.

A body of clergymen of the Evangelium party, who had desired to protest at the meeting of the National Synod, had been unable to find a room in which to hold a meeting, and had been compelled in the end to affix printed notices of their protest to the trees in the parks of the town.

The New Constitution was now in action. The Reichsbishop was in office, and it remained to be seen how successfully he would be able to carry out his proposals. The Evangelium clergy under the energetic guidance of Pfarrers Niemoller and Jacobi had founded an Emergency League to stand for the faith of the church and to resist any interference therewith. Hossenfelder and the Deutsche Christen continued their activities and in the Province of Prussia there were not a few instances where the Aryan Clause was put into operation, and there were many more where clergymen who came under that clause were given to understand by their Parish Councils that their resignations would be acceptable. So matters went on until the 12th of November when a great meeting of Deutsche Christen took place at the Sport Palace in Berlin. This was under the chairmanship of Dr. Krause, the leader of the Deutsche Christen in Berlin. The great hall which holds about 5,000 people was full to overflowing. Bishop Hossenfelder and several other of the newly-appointed bishops were present on the platform. Dr. Krause made a speech, in the course of which he demanded that the Aryan paragraph agreed to by the General Synod should be enforced and that all those of foreign blood, i.e. non-Aryan, who were Protestant Christians, should be joined together in parishes of their own particular kind. He further demanded that there should be a rejection of all foreign and non-German elements from church services

and Creed. Dr. Krause called for the expulsion of all non-Aryan people from the church without compromise. He stated that in connection with this demand it would be needed:

- (a) to do away with the Old Testament as a religious book;
- (b) to carry out the Aryan paragraph strictly;
- (c) to remove from office all leaders in the church who were not enthusiastic supporters of the National Socialistic movement.

The Deutsche Christen had at last come into the open and declared themselves. Hossenfelder had not been present at the speech, having left the meeting when he had introduced Dr. Krause. But there was little doubt that the views expressed were known to him and were his own views. The fact remained that Hossenfelder was the leader of the Deutsche Christen party and that neither he nor any of the other leaders present at the meeting made any protest when Dr. Krause voiced his views. The Reichsbishop, when the matter was brought to his notice by the Emergency League, took immediate and energetic action. He dismissed Dr. Krause from all his offices and stated that "such witness and such demands are none other than an intolerable attack on the faith of our church. I will never under any circumstances permit such heresy to be spread in the Evangelical Church."

A strong protest, widely signed by the less extreme members of the Deutsche Christen party dissociating themselves from Dr. Krause, was forwarded to the Reichsbishop and published.

This action on the part of the Reichsbishop did much to ease the situation though it did not entirely clear it up. The Emergency League felt, rightly, that the matter could not be left there. There were so many of the new church dignitaries involved that further action was needed. The League demanded the resignation of Hossenfelder, and they threatened that unless this were forthcoming there would be a schism. The Emergency League, which had started in a small way, had grown to large proportions. From a few clergymen in Berlin it had now spread to a membership of over 3,000 clergymen in the whole country with their parishes behind them, and

was growing daily. Their demands therefore had now considerable weight. Bishop Schoeffel of Hamburg resigned his position on the Spiritual Council as a protest against the Deutsche Christen meeting.

Before matters had reached this pitch, arrangements had been made for the installation of the Reichsbishop in the Cathedral of Berlin on the first Sunday in Advent, the 3rd of December. On Sunday, the 26th of November, in the churches of the members of the Emergency League a declaration was read from the pulpits, saying that they, the clergy, were standing firm for the Faith and urging their people to support them.

On Monday, the 27th of November, it was evident that wide support was forthcoming, especially from South Germany. The Bishops of Bavaria, Saxony and Hessen resigned. They stated that they were prepared to support the action of the Reichsbishop, but that that action had not gone far enough in dealing with the heretical ideas put forward by the extreme Deutsche Christen.

The Reichsbishop had already condemned the speech of Dr. Krause and dismissed him from office. He had further put out a proclamation suspending the working of the Aryan Clause. It was obvious therefore that the action of the Emergency League was directed towards getting rid of the other Deutsche Christen leaders who had been concerned in the meeting, notably of course Hossenfelder.

On December 2nd Hossenfelder and the remaining members of the Spiritual Council resigned, and the Reichsbishop was left without an executive through whom to work.

The installation for December 3rd was abandoned.

Late on December 3rd the Reichsbishop appointed a new Spiritual Council, Dr. Laurer to represent the Lutheran churches, Dr. Beyer to represent Prussia and Dr. Weber to represent the Reformed churches. It is even now not certain whether they will consent to take office. The Reichsbishop further put out a decree which prohibits anyone who is a member of any ecclesiastical party from holding office in the church. The offices intended to be covered by this decree

were the Spiritual Council and the higher executive offices of the church. The position is extremely difficult. Legally the Emergency League are justified in claiming that the original elections were carried out under pressure from the Deutsche Christen, and in consequence did not show a fair result, and must therefore be held again. This would mean that even the Reichsbishop's office was not confirmed, and that a fresh election to that office would have to be held.

This does not however seem to be their wish. What they do desire is that a strong Spiritual Council should be appointed who will stand behind the Reichsbishop, and face the difficult questions that have arisen. Their fear is that with a weak council the questions might be shelved and a temporary and superficial peace arrived at in consequence while underneath was unrest and dissatisfaction.

They realize the impossibility of opening a campaign for the evangelization of the country unless these questions are faced and a decision arrived at.

It must be remembered that the Emergency League members are not opposed to the Nazi Government. They are most of them ardent supporters of it but they are opposing the introduction of the political atmosphere into the church and will resist to the last any endeavour on the part of the Deutsche Christen extremists to tamper with the faith of the church.

Events move with such rapidity that it is impossible to foresee what may be the outcome of these events, even before these words are printed. On the whole the feeling is optimistic for the future. The issues are known and clear, and it cannot but be that a satisfactory solution will be found which will enable the church of Germany to go forward with her great work in harmony and friendship with the rest of Christendom.

REVIEWS.

A History of Political Thought. By PHYLLIS DOYLE. (Cape). 10s. 6d.

WE envy Miss Doyle not only her knowledge but also her courage, for it is a courageous task to write the history of political thought from the Greeks to our own day in a book of 319 pages. Nor is she content to discuss the writers who have given outstanding contributions to political thought. She seeks to set out the background that influenced them far more than they ever imagined. Herein is the distinguishing quality of an able book. For her volume is essentially a history of *idées-forces* and not only of literary ideas. The pursuit of such a plan entails disadvantages as well as advantages, and no one is more aware of this than the author. The supreme advantage is that it is utterly impossible to assess the value of any theorist until we know the relation of his views to his age, and in manifold form this point is pressed home again and again. On the other hand, her book is far more adapted to the advanced student than the beginner in the fascinating task of a survey of the growth of political conceptions. To such a student her writing is full of suggestion, and where you do not agree with her she compels you to think out the reasons of your disagreement.

That there are gaps in the reading of the author is only too obvious. The writer of the history of political thought requires a wide knowledge of law and philosophy, a wider knowledge of national and of comparative history. Who is sufficient for all this? Miss Doyle possesses a reasonable competence, but we question if she possesses not only the competence but that familiar competence that consists in long brooding over theory and background essential to the true unfolding of any system of thought, coherent or incoherent; and indeed she occasionally falls before the temptation of the recorder of all forms of thought, and that is to render the system of the thinker more

coherent than it really is. Around all great thought there is a haze, and in this haze there often lies the ethos of the system, and this ethos is no less luminous than the system itself. If Miss Doyle falls before this abiding temptation, she sins in the company of many an historian before her. That there are other slips in exact historical knowledge is at times certain, and by these slips we do not mean errors in interpretation but errors in fact. We would, in fact, press upon her the duty of a searching revision of her whole book until these errors are eliminated and her bibliographies, or rather those of Professor Laski, are made more exhaustive than they are at present.

The question of interpretation is clearly far more difficult to determine than the question of fact. It is one thing to state that Aristotle advocated the selection of magistrates *by lot* from amongst the recognised aristocracy of ability, and it is quite another to hold that the four gospels are not "reliable sources of political theory" on the ground that they apparently are "second-hand records obscured by religious sentiment." Seemingly Miss Doyle expected our Lord to have laid down a code in which he stated precisely his attitude to liberty and slavery, and to guilds and the latifundia. Surely it is perfectly plain that the four gospels contain principles, not the maxims that Miss Doyle seems to desiderate. For if the gospels had contained maxims, they would long ago have been rendered out-of-date by the changing conditions of the successive ages. Throughout her book we are conscious of the weakness of her interpretation of the religious forces of the century which she is discussing. Nor are we more content with her to regard the Reformation as a "reaction" which proved unable to suppress completely "the belief in the dignity of human nature particularly emphasised in the Renaissance." No doubt there were Reformation systems of belief and conduct which seemed to depress the worth of the individual, but in spite of this depression it is possible to draw a line between the permanent and the passing elements in such systems. Take Calvinism with its view of the depravity of the human race. Yes, but take also its view that belief in the sovereignty of God creates a majestic conception of God that lies at the root of reverent religion. It also lies at the root of the making of strong men, a matter insufficiently realised by Miss Doyle. There was only

one thing the Calvinist feared, and that was sin. There was only one being he feared, and that was God. The Calvinist feared God with all the fierce intentness of his nature, and this exhausted his capacity for fear. What was man, even though he be a king, compared with the King of kings? Everything is *sub specie aeternitatis*. Nor does the power of God mean the powerlessness of man. If Luther could say, "Credo, ergo sum," Calvin could in turn say, "Ago, ergo credo." The belief in predestination formed the school of vigorous ecclesiastical and political life. God is active and energetic, and therefore his servant, man, must also be active and energetic. Order and obedience, gravity and chastity, temperance in life and sobriety in thought are qualities every whit as valuable for the State as for the church. Economy and industry lead on to property, and this in turn leads on to prosperity in the State as much as in the church. The sovereignty of God might seem at first sight as if it would lean on absolutism in politics, whereas it does nothing of the kind. The fear of God took away the fear of man. As no power comes from man, and all power comes from God, all in his sight, kings and subjects alike, are equal. There is a halo around the heavenly King: there is none around the earthly king.

ROBERT H. MURRAY.

The Counter-Reformation. By B. J. KIDD. (The S.P.C.K.).
8s. 6d.

ONE of the most welcome signs of late years has been the revival of "The Church Historical Society," and it is fitting that Dr. Kidd's clear book should belong to this fine series. He surveys the Counter-Reformation from 1550 to 1600, and in his survey he is abreast of the most recent knowledge. How enormously that knowledge has been increased of late years is as obvious to him, as it is to all scholars. In the modest compass of 219 pages he can do no more than briefly consider the outstanding aspects of the Counter-Reformation, and he considers them to some purpose. The revival of religion in Italy and Spain from 1520 to 1580; the Jesuits to the year 1572; the Roman Inquisition; the Council of Trent; the Great Powers and the Catholic

Revival; the Netherlands and France, 1563-72; the forces behind the revival, 1572-98; the dissensions among the reformers; and the course of the reaction in the Netherlands and France, the British Isles, the Baltic lands, Switzerland and Savoy, and Germany. Here is a large area to be surveyed, and it says much for the sense of proportion of the author that he manages to survey it in a manner satisfactory to the thoughtful reader. The outstanding feature of the whole book is the feeling of cosmopolitanism that pervades it. For instance, compared with the reaction abroad, the reaction in England was slight, and accordingly Dr. Kidd bestows upon it no more than four pages. Surely there cannot be a better proof of the power of the author to hold the scales evenly.

He adopts the wise policy of noting the different steps in the revival of religion in Italy and Spain, for we must never forget the fact that the Roman communion was every whit as much reformed as the English. We can hardly conceive that the Vatican would care to erect statues to Luther or Calvin, to Cranmer or Knox, yet their action in their respective communions provoked actions and reactions in the Roman communion, and it is sufficient to state that the priests and the friars of Boccaccio's "Decameron" could no longer exist and that popes of the type of Alexander VI and Leo X definitely disappeared. There was, then, a real revival of religion, and this revival in the Latin Church inevitably wore the form of systematic organisation. The Jesuits, the Roman Inquisition, and the Council of Trent were the natural outcome of this great revival. Dr. Kidd insists, and rightly insists, on linking this revival of religion with the fresh organisations to which a revival tends. The Council of Trent occupies a very conspicuous place in this book. It is odd to remember that this Council almost succeeded in removing music from its place in public worship, one of the many curious evidences that it was determined on the regimenting of the Church of Rome. Dr. Kidd entertains no delusions on the thoroughly Italian nature of the Council of Trent. Out of the 255 prelates who signed it, no less than 189 were Italians, the creatures of the Curia. Notwithstanding this composition, it contributed to the clearing up of the creed and the practice of the Roman communion. Some of the awkward questions, e.g. the primacy of the Pope,

were left for time to settle, and this question of papal supremacy was not settled till the Vatican Council of 1870. We are by no means sure that now and then it is not the distinct duty of the church to state deliberately that she does not know at the moment, and that she must postpone the solution of a question to the distant future. The strength of the Church of England, in taking a long view of the matter, has been that repeatedly she has intimated that she does not know. But here we are betaking ourselves to wider issues than those the author can take into account. His book is a valuable one, and is the ablest short account of the Counter-Reformation in English with which we are acquainted.

ROBERT H. MURRAY.

Calvin. By R. N. CAREW HUNT. (Centenary Press. 1933). 10s. 6d.

THIS is a model biography and it has been compressed into 316 pages. The bibliography surprises us by its extent and then we are further surprised that it does not include many books referred to in the footnotes. The Index is full and useful.

Mr. Carew Hunt carries the burden of his erudition with ease. It never confuses the clarity of his style, or hampers the flow of his narrative. This is the more remarkable because the bitter controversies over Calvin extend to the facts of his life. Mr. Carew Hunt sifts the evidence like a very competent judge, and is fair-minded in apportioning praise and blame. He is himself no hero-worshipper and no believer in Calvinism, but he has an intense interest in the personality of one of the world's greatest men and a sympathetic understanding of his aims and his theology.

On one small point we are inclined to disagree with him. He thinks Calvin was "an exceedingly timid and reserved boy." We believe he ought to have written "sensitive and reserved." It was because he was sensitive that he was able to make such intimate friends, and it was because he was sensitive that in the presence of strangers he protected himself with an armour of reserve. The fable that he was nicknamed by loose-living

students in Paris "the Accusative Case" is at any rate *ben trovato*. He was not a person given to hot-headed expostulation, but it is easy to imagine his disapproving demeanour in the presence of folly and vice. By nature he had been intended for a prig, and he was only saved from priggishness by his deepening conviction of his own sin. This led to self-discipline and he denied himself all the pleasures and relaxations of life. His very marriage was rather a protest against clerical celibacy than the indulgence of a natural instinct. Such austerity was another barrier between himself and the majority of men. He was afraid of his own sensibility, but he remained sensitive to what others thought and did, and, protecting himself against them, his reserve became an armour of triple proof. Mr. Carew Hunt has stripped it from him and shows us one who was neither a monster nor a demigod, but a man. He has made him intelligible, for only a man who was sensitive to the needs of others could have called forth so great a response.

Calvin was drilled in scholastic logic at Paris, and became learned in the principles of jurisprudence in Orleans; and it was this mental discipline which enabled him to systematise a new theology and legislate for a new church. His theology is easy to travesty and has often been travestied; but in a few pages Mr. Carew Hunt makes us understand its power and its appeal. Calvinism was an absolute religion. Its creed, morals and organisation were consistent. They came from the mind of the one man, and he was confident in the validity of his own reasoning processes. In them he wanted no help and would endure no criticism. Clever young men, who came to Geneva to be more or less his disciples and to co-operate in his work, did not stay very long and sometimes left in a hurry. Calvin was surprised at *their* lack of humility. Humility he considered such a necessary virtue for a Christian.

Calvin did not truckle to princes or flatter town councils. He despised the mob and would make no concessions to human frailty; but he could wait patiently for a long time for the right moment to strike. It is well to remember that when he was dictating to a great part of Europe, he was far from secure in Geneva, and that city only made him a citizen in the closing years of his life. The Libertines were for long a formidable opposition. At times it seemed that they would prevail. Calvin

waited his opportunity when his enemies were concerned and when it came he was ruthless.

He had been ruthless in the case of Servetus, and many have condemned him not only for causing a heretic to be burnt, but for a breach of confidence in regard to letters that Servetus had written to himself. Mr. Carew Hunt gives a perfectly reasonable reconstruction of the events which led up to the trial at Geneva, and by accepting it Calvin is largely exonerated from the imputations of his enemies. It is quite certain however that he intended that Servetus should die though he desired that he should be spared the pain of burning. Many years before he had imperilled his own life by staying in Paris with the hope of converting Servetus; but he would not imperil the orthodoxy of the future by suffering an unconverted Servetus to survive.

It would seem impossible that any one should love Calvin, but we have to remember that Fazel, Vizet, de Trie and Beza did love him, for there were a few to whom he could open his heart. To most men, and even to his enthusiastic disciples, he was an object of terror. His own awful austerity kept men at a distance; while the rigid precision of his ethical code made men feel uncomfortable in his presence. Yet no one doubted the sincerity of his dying words: "I have wanted to do well: my sins have always displeased me, and the fear of God has ever been in my heart."

H. MAYNARD SMITH.

The Christian Renaissance. By G. WILSON KNIGHT. (Macmillan). pp. 374. 12s. 6d. net.

PROFESSOR KNIGHT is such an enthusiastic student of literature, he has such an intimate knowledge of the great writers of the world, that this ought to have been a most valuable book; and yet, in spite of its many good qualities it fails to convince, and in the end wearies rather than stimulates. With the main theses of the book few will disagree; indeed, we have been in agreement with them before we met them again in these pages.

Professor Knight reminds us that great writers like Dante or Shakespeare are not only children of the age in which they live, but have qualities which are of permanent value for all

time. It is true we shall understand both poets better if we can reconstruct the background against which they lived. This indeed is all that some critics do, thus making the frame more important than the picture. But the writer who is merely a child of his age, dies with his age; the great writer like the great prophet has something in him which transcends the limit of time.

Professor Knight's theory of the use of symbolism by the poets is already well known and much that he says is true and to the point. But he is inclined to ride his theory to death. Symbolism is so common to nearly all writers, that it is often no more than a literary device. There is no need to suppose that Shakespeare had some subtle reason for introducing a storm in the scene of Lear's madness. As a stage-craftsman he knew that "noises off" would increase the impression of terror he meant to convey to the audience. We find exactly the same thing in Victorian melodrama. The innocent heroine driven from home, is always accompanied by falling snow, typical of purity and innocence, so soon to be trampled in the mire by the cruelty of man. And what shall we say of a passage like this: "Over all this action Theseus stands as a man in whom discords are resolved. He shares with Bottom and Oberon the dominance of the drama, but finally dominates both. For he is an unbeliever in all frenzied imaginations whether of the lunatic, lover, or poet. His poetry is incarnated in life. He is thus a Christ-figure, possesses the Christ-harmony. So the essence of destruction in Shakespeare is a nature-spirit dislocation; the corresponding harmony is life creation." This of *A Midsummer Night's Dream*; a pleasant fantasy for performance in a garden! Even more fantastic is his commentary on the stage direction in *Macbeth*: "Thunder. First apparition, an armed head." "This shews us a hideous dislocation, a mockery of the human organism; yet it is iron plated and menacing. It reflects the absurdity of Macbeth's evil course, his murderous acts. He is the head of the community, absurdly severed from the body, Scotland." Yet the words which follow the apparition in the play shew it as merely a warning that Macbeth will be slain in the end by his enemy Macduff. Some no doubt will find the author's subtle interpretations vastly inspiring; and some perhaps will say with W. S. Gilbert:

“Nonsense, but O, what precious nonsense”; and we must leave it at that.

Professor Knight hits the nail on the head when he reminds us of the divorce between art and religion at the present day. And he is right in urging the need of a new union between Christianity and poetry. From this union there should be born something new and splendid, even as the union of Faust and Helen gave birth to the modern age. But the presentation of Christianity in these pages is, to say the least of it, strange. To the unbeliever it will be a grotesque dream, to the orthodox anathema.

A few examples will suffice to shew what we mean. The identification of the Holy Spirit with Eros will not please many, nor convince; and the exposition of the Trinity surely reaches the limit of intellectual extravagance. Shelley's “Prometheus,” we are told, helps us to understand the Trinity. “Shelley here dramatizes a universal conflict. Prometheus is mankind or mankind's champion; it is the same thing, and often we must think of God the Son as likewise personifying humanity. Prometheus is noble, courageous, good. He suffers under Jupiter, a god, cruel, stupid and evil. This is so far an easy symbolism to understand. Prometheus corresponds to God the Son, and Jupiter to God the Father in so far as he is *in conflict with the Son*. We must always remember that the First Person tends to include evil as well as good, yet as we shall see Jupiter is not himself finally the real God”; and again: “I have said that God the Father must be allowed to include evil. This is only partly true. If we are to see evil in a single theological person it must be in the Father, since Satan is not personified in the Trinity. But the truer solution is to be found in terms of the Father-Son relation. The Holy Spirit cannot exist in *its* bright splendour when the Father-Son relation is starkly out of joint, it is then Demogorgon, a dark agony, a lonely progress in the imaginative world.”

Now we do not pretend to understand all this, but one thing is plain, Professor Knight's exposition of the Trinity bears no resemblance to the Christian view of that doctrine.

This is, as we have said, a bewildering book, for though the main ideas are acceptable, and indeed are no new discovery, yet what we may call the author's “asides,” his interpretations

of his theses, often amaze, sometimes irritate, but rarely convince.

The book is eloquently written; perhaps the eloquence is too sustained, and we long at times for the relief of a dull sentence, a little light and shade. It would seem that the irresistible rush of the author's style, has at times led him into saying more than he would otherwise have done.

S. ADDLESHAW.

The Epistle to the Romans. KARL BARTH, translated by E. C. HOSKYNS. (Oxford University Press). 21s.

BARTHIANISM is variously regarded—by this critic as a lesser of post-War evils, by that as the salvation of modern religion: it is viewed—now as rooted in the doctrine that all virtue is *sola gratia*, now as emphasizing the transcendent character of the supernatural order. It is inevitable, then, that many will approach this translation with the idea that it is a text-book of the Barthian position from which they may decide for themselves as to its nature and value. But in his preface to the English translation, Barth begs us not to do this. The book is emphatically biblical exegesis, not “a free fantasia upon the theme of religion.” We are reading, not a Barthian *apologia*, but a commentary on *Romans* by Karl Barth as Pastor of Safenwil. “My sole aim,” he declares, “was to interpret Scripture.”

Barth's method is to treat linguistic discussion, as well as literary and historical criticism, not as irrelevant and useless, but as only “a prolegomenon to the understanding of the epistle.” He recalls us to “the systematic interpretation” of Calvin and to “that creative energy which Luther exercised with intuitive certainty in his exegesis.” Accordingly, he protests against such modern exegesis as Jülicher's—“the mere deciphering of words as though they were runes”—and in his commentary before us, textual and historical criticism is not prominent, but it appears, as relevantly as unostentatiously, in a way which illustrates Barth's contention that it can only provide the foundation for exposition. The result is that his Commentary is not a dissertation on “select readings,” nor a series of philological notes of varying relevance; but an exposition of *Romans* in which higher criticism plays the proper

rôle of handmaid. On the other hand, Barth's careful translation of *pistis* as now "faith," now "faithfulness," suggests a profound knowledge of its several uses in the LXX and an intimate familiarity with the mind of Paul.

Barth's distinctive views may have intruded in places on disinterested exegesis, but it will not suffice to dismiss the book with a curt "unadulterated Barthianism," and those who consider Barth's exposition false, must see to it that they are criticizing Barth and not Paul. Clearly, Barth finds himself in close agreement with Paul, and to this considerable extent Barthianism is Paulinism. The gradual reinstatement (at least among English critics of the gospels) of a catholic Christology—after a generation or more of a humanitarian Christ—is a warning that the emasculated Paulinism which has so often been found in the epistles represents, not Paul, but his interpreters; and that Barth's full-blooded interpretation may after all be nearer the heart of Pauline theology.

What, then, is Barth's exposition of *Romans*? "Where the faithfulness of God encounters the fidelity of men, there is manifested his righteousness. There shall the righteous man live. This is the theme of the Epistle." "Grace is the gift of Christ, who exposes the gulf which separates God and man, and, by exposing it, bridges it," whilst the "faith" which "accepts grace" is "the fidelity of a man to the faithfulness of God." God is practically Luther's *deus absconditus* and "to him that is not sufficiently mature to accept a contradiction [the Gospel] becomes a scandal—to him that is unable to escape the necessity of contradiction, it becomes a matter for faith." We are here reminded of the common complaint against Barthianism, that it under-estimates the value of reason in religion. Barth would retort, however, that the "necessity of contradiction" in the gospel which implies the intellectual inadequacy of rationalism was recognized by Paul no less than by the Barthians to-day. It would seem, too, that the epistles provide considerable evidence for this contention, and it is not irrelevant to observe that not even Aquinas regarded the *Summa Theologica*, perhaps the most thoroughgoing attempt to rationalize religion, as a final synthesis of theology.

To describe Sir Edwyn Hoskyn's translation as masterly is to do him scant justice. He has freely handled Barth's

intricate argument and close reasoning in a way which is a tribute at once to his knowledge of German and command of English. As a commentary of Paul, who has the first claim to be an interpreter of the gospel, this translation is a book which should be read, not only by every clergyman and ordinand, but by all who are interested in the fundamental problems of theology.

C. S. NYE.

Public School Religion. Edited by ARNOLD LUNN. (Faber and Faber, Ltd.).

MR. LUNN has written a critical essay on religious teaching in public schools, and has been successful in eliciting replies from a varied assortment of persons distinguished in the academic world. As a critic Mr. Lunn is devastating. His positive suggestions, which may not unfairly be reduced to the cry of "Back to Paley," seem strangely inadequate to the disastrous situation he exposes.

No less than three headmasters are among his contributors. Of these Mr. Bisbeker, Headmaster of the (Methodist) Leys School at Cambridge, is much the best. Even those who disagree with his conclusions cannot fail to admire his essay as a very carefully thought out statement of the whole problem of religious education. Mr. Hollis writes with convincing sincerity of religious instruction in English Roman Catholic schools. But Roman Catholicism is in this country the religion of an enthusiastic minority, and the problems of "minority" and "majority" religions differ enormously. It would have been more illuminating if, despite the differences of educational tradition and method, we could have had a contributor from some country where the Roman faith is the established religion of the majority of the population. The best of the Anglican writers is the Bishop of Bradford, who alone among them avoids the substitution of rhetoric for thought. He regards the inadequacy of religious instruction in public schools as the most glaring instance of a general failure to "promote sound learning" through lack of competent educational method.

There are four principal issues:

(1) *The defective teaching of history.* Schoolboys, it is

complained, learn nothing of the vast effect in human affairs which has been produced by Christianity. Most schoolboys in point of fact learn nothing but isolated periods of classical history, and local English history, divorced from its European context and narrated by Whig propagandists. The teaching of history and the teaching of the Bible suffer from the same drawback. Both subjects are too vast to be compressed within the boundaries of a school career. What we need is something corresponding to Mr. Wells' *Outline of History* written by a Christian and a historian, together with the intensive study for educational purposes of a selected period.

(2) *Biblical teaching.* Mr. Lunn grossly over-estimates the number of unbelieving schoolmasters. It is obvious that no master, who does not believe in the Scriptures, ought to be compelled to teach them. But the main difficulty is not lack of goodwill. It is lack of competence. The reviewer knows of one famous public school where a preparatory class for masters was conducted by a canon, who happened to be an eminent New Testament scholar, of the cathedral church in the same city. The arrangement was welcomed by the masters themselves. There can be no insuperable obstacle to similar arrangements in other public schools.

(3) *Preparation for Confirmation.* This appears to be normally divided between the headmaster and the housemaster. We are persuaded for one sufficient reason that such an arrangement is wrong. The Anglican system clearly regards auricular confession as available for everybody and an appropriate remedy for serious sin. It is difficult to understand how anyone who is familiar with the problems of public school life can be prepared to deny the offer of this remedy to the schoolboy. But if the necessary discipline of a school is not to be paralysed (or the knowledge acquired through confessions to be betrayed) it is essential that the person who hears confessions should be someone who stands outside the disciplinary hierarchy. A school chaplain to undertake the preparation of confirmation candidates is certainly required.

(4) *The teaching of the Christian faith.* We think the fundamental weakness of public school religion is revealed in an astonishing remark by Dr. Alington. "The first thing a boy should be taught in school is to know the Bible, . . . after he

has passed what may be called the School Certificate age the choice is wide . . . he can be instructed in the outline of the Christian Faith" (pp. 60 and 61). This is not an ignoring but a flat defiance of the entire Anglican system. The School Certificate age is that at which the average public schoolboy is confirmed. The Prayer Book demands that he shall then already be familiar with the outlines of the Christian faith—the meaning of the creed, the meaning of duty, the meaning of prayer, the meaning of sacraments. There are plenty of manuals available. We need only mention Dr. Gore's *The Religion of the Church*, and the Bishop of Gloucester's *What it means to be a Christian*. If before his confirmation the schoolboy is made familiar with the fundamental truths of the Christian religion; if after his confirmation he is carefully taught the grounds for believing in these truths; we shall cease to let loose on the world young men a prey to "every wind of doctrine."

Mr. Lunn bids us return to Paley. We shall do better if we go behind Arnold, and back to Cranmer.

PHILIP USHER.

SHORT NOTICES.

Israelitische und Altorientalische Weisheit. Von D. DR. WALTER BAUMGARTNER. (J. C. B. Mohr, Tübingen). 2s. 6d.

ONLY a master of the subject could give so much valuable information in so small a compass. In this *brochure* of thirty pages Dr. Baumgartner gives first a succinct account of Hebrew Wisdom, yet, with one exception, omitting nothing that is essential ; then he deals with the wisdom of other ancient oriental countries, Egypt and Babylonia, showing that Israel's wisdom books were part of a world-literature.

Regarding Israel's contribution he rightly points to its twofold aspect : on the one hand, it has a purely secular side ; in all the affairs of life right action brings its own reward, wrong-doing entails punishment in one form or another ; that is to say, the teaching is simply utilitarian ; there is no urging to do good for its own sake, or to avoid evil just because it is evil ; it is merely a question of obtaining advantages, or securing oneself against misfortune.

But, on the other hand, Hebrew wisdom has a strong religious basis : wisdom comes from God, and its observance leads to God ; its highest form is the fear of the Lord, which must also be its initial incentive. Right living and wrong doing do not automatically bring their own respective consequences ; the reward of the one, and the punishment of the other, are from God.

One thing Dr. Baumgartner does not deal with which might well have received some mention, and that is the considerable differences between the earlier and later Hebrew wisdom writers, *e.g.* the universalistic outlook of the former, and the nationalistic attitude of the latter ; and there are various not unimportant differences.

Dr. Baumgartner lays great stress, and with reason, on the extraneous, especially Egyptian, influences to be observed in the Hebrew wisdom literature ; this becomes quite obvious when the two are compared, and nobody would dream of denying it ; but we question whether Dr. Baumgartner has done sufficient justice to the individuality of the Hebrew writers ; nor does he give weight to the possibility of the Hebrews, with their religious genius, having influenced their *confrères* of other nations in the religious domain. When men of like mind associate, whether directly or indirectly or through their writings, is it not somewhat arbitrary to suppose that the influence must all be on one side ?

But however this may be, Dr. Baumgartner has given us here a valuable contribution to a subject which is receiving much attention at the present time ; it should not be overlooked by anyone interested in the ancient oriental wisdom literature.

W.O.E.O.

Die Altorientalische Weisheit in ihrer Israelitisch-Jüdischen Ausprägung. Von JOHANNES FICHTNER (Töpelmann, m. 6.80. [1933]).

THIS is one of the many valuable "Beihefte" of the well-known *Zatw* which have done so much for the wider and deeper understanding of the Old Testament writings.

Owing to the publication within comparatively recent years of a number of Egyptian and Babylonian Wisdom books it has become generally recognised that the Wisdom literature of the Hebrews is not the specific production of the Hebrew genius, but part of a world-literature. With the recognition of this fact arose, however, the question as to the measure in which the Hebrew Wisdom writers were indebted to extraneous sources and influences for their work. This question became more especially insistent when, with the publication of the Egyptian Wisdom book called "The Teaching of Amen-em-ope," it was seen that a section of the *Book of Proverbs* was more or less identical with parts of the Egyptian book. There is not unanimity among experts regarding dates here, so that priority in point of time cannot be assigned to one or the other ; hence the question of indebtedness on the part of the one or the other writer must be examined from some other standpoint. It is not, of course, a question into which we can go here, suffice it to say, though not desiring to dogmatize, that there are certain indications which necessitate the assumption that the Hebrew sage was indebted to the Egyptian sage ; on the other hand, when it is found that a pronouncedly religious note—so characteristic of the Hebrew Wisdom literature—runs through the Egyptian book—and this is not as a rule emphasized in the Egyptian Wisdom literature—one is justified in asking whether in this respect the Egyptian sage may not have been influenced by his Hebrew *confrère* ?

We have drawn attention here to an isolated illustration regarding the question of influence on one side or the other ; but what is required, before dealing properly with the subject is a review of the whole field of the Wisdom literatures of Egypt, Babylon and Palestine.

Within certain limits this is what Fichtner has done in the volume before us ; he does not profess to present a detailed account of the Wisdom literature of each of these countries ; his main object has been, on the one hand, to show that there existed a real relationship between Israel and the rest of the ancient east in this domain : and, on the other, to demonstrate that the Wisdom literature of Palestine developed a character of its own under the influence of religious thought-movements peculiarly Jewish.

In doing this he examines and compares, from a variety of points of view—such as the content of the teaching of Wisdom, Wisdom in its ethical nature, the religious basis of Wisdom, etc.—the three literatures; the wealth of references offered is immensely useful ; and both the parallelism of thought, and the individual characteristics of the three literatures are carefully set forth.

Another matter with which Fichtner deals very ably is the difference of extraneous influences on the earlier and later parts of the Hebrew Wisdom literature ; this calls also for a comparison between these earlier and later parts of the Hebrew literature. Roughly speaking, the former is comprised in some of the earlier Wisdom *Psalms*, *Job*, *Proverbs*, and *Ecclesiastes*, *i.e.*, the canonical Wisdom books ; the latter include the later wisdom *Psalms*, the *Wisdom of Ben-Sira* (*Ecclesiasticus*), the *Wisdom of Solomon*, *Pirke Aboth*, and one or two others of less importance. In showing the difference between these two sets of Wisdom writings in doctrine, and in general point of view, owing to different causes, Fichtner has presented a piece of work of real importance and interest, as well as of permanent value. To note the changing conception of God, and to realize the compelling reason for this ; to see a retrograde step in one direction, an advancing one in another, and understanding in each case why it was being taken ; to observe a gradually narrowing mental outlook, and to see how the circumstances of the times made this almost inevitable—these are matters of intense interest, and make one realize how important the Hebrew Wisdom literature was as reflecting some of the phases of later Jewish belief and thought.

W.O.E.O.

Wortempfang und Symbol in der Alttestamentlichen Prophetie.
Von FRIEDRICH HAEUSSERMANN. (Töpelmann [1932]). m. 6.50.

A SUB-TITLE describes this book as “an investigation of the psychology of prophetic experience.” The task which the author sets

himself is the attempt to discern the way in which the word of Yahweh originates within the spirit of him who receives it. He bases his thesis on the fundamental fact that the knowledge which we have of our inner being is very limited, and that the unknown, *i.e.*, that which transcends our apprehension, works within us not less intensively than that of which we have cognizance. The first contact which takes place between the prophet and the divine spirit is this "unapprehendable" element working in the deepest recesses of the soul of the recipient. In the process of his investigation Haeussermann traverses a good deal of familiar ground, but he is an original thinker and has much to say which is illuminating. Full of instructive material is his examination of the technical terms applied to him who receives the word of Yahweh: *roeh* "seer," *chozeh* "visionary," *nabi* "prophet"; and of the expressions used in reference to the "word" and its reception: "thus saith Yahweh," "the word of Yahweh," "oracle of Yahweh," "burden" (*massa*), "the mouth of Yahweh," "the hand of Yahweh," the "spirit." Considerable space is devoted to the many occasions mentioned in the Old Testament of the word of Yahweh being conveyed in symbolic form; and much valuable material will be found in the section entitled "Psychological remarks on individual visions," where various visions experienced by the prophets Amos, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and Zechariah are examined and explained. But perhaps the most interesting part of the book is the third division where the author goes into the details of what a prophet experiences when the word of Yahweh, in one or other of manifold forms, has been apprehended by him, and how he comes to explain to himself what it means and the message intended to be conveyed by it. Naturally enough, there will be differences of opinion on many things, but there can be no doubt that Haeussermann has provided us with a volume full of interest and of thought-provoking subjects.

W.O.E.O.

The Council of Trent and Anglican Formularies. By H. E. SYMONDS, B.D. (O.U.P., 1933). 12s. 6d.

IN the XVII Century a book was written by the Franciscan Davenport, who called himself Sancta Clara, to harmonise the XXXIX Articles into the Decrees of Trent. His well intended book had the singular fortune to be licensed at Rome, repudiated in England, and placed upon the Index Expurgatorius in Spain. In the XVIII Century the Sorbonne condescended to examine

the Articles and gave them a modified approval consequent upon the negotiations between Wake and Du Pin ; but the ardour of the Gallicans for reunion with England soon cooled. In the XIX Century, Newman published his ill fated Tract 90—a marvel of dialectical dexterity based upon insufficient knowledge. And now in the XXth Century Fr. Symonds produces his *Council of Trent and Anglican Formularies*, and we wish him better luck than his predecessors, as he is better equipped for his task.

Anglicans are only called upon to give a general consent to the Articles in their literal and grammatical sense, and are certainly not bound by the private opinions of those who drafted them. They were published by men who did not agree with one another, who were not always consistent with themselves, who were seeking by terms of comprehension to unite all within one Church. On points where men were divided they were intentionally ambiguous and, as Dr. Hamilton Thompson says, sometimes "succeeded in saying two things in one breath with remarkable adroitness."

So it is entirely justifiable that one writer should emphasise the agreement of the Articles with the Augsburg Confession although certain Lutheran catchwords have been toned down or avoided, while another with equal justification should show that the Articles are not incompatible with the Helvetic Confession, though they may lack the clear cut theological precision of that document. A third, like Father Symonds, cannot be condemned for showing that the Articles are not really irreconcilable with the decrees of Trent, although they certainly condemn some of the popular teaching prevalent in the Mediaeval Church. There were quite as many cross currents at the Council of Trent as there were in the Church of England. The Council of Trent, silently indeed, disposed of much that was extravagant in the later Middle Ages. Its decrees often are carefully drafted compromises, and some are only inserted for fear of conceding anything to Lutheranism. They also are to be interpreted in their literal and grammatical sense and not by the known opinions of Lainez or of the Cardinal of Lorraine.

Father Symonds has done his work well and not in a controversial spirit. He insists quite rightly that the Articles, the Prayer Book and the Homilies must be studied together and assumed not to contradict one another. Then on comparison of these formularies with the Council of Trent he shows on how many points there is an essential agreement. Of this there can now be no manner of doubt, although in the fog of war it was not recognised on either side. Again in his role of mediator he pleads for agreement on some doubtful points, and on all of them we sympathise

with him, while we have to admit that so far as the formularies are concerned he has a rather poor case. Before a reconciliation can be brought about we must resolve to see that what is best in Rome best represents that Church, and not specialise in the abuses and corruptions to which any Church is always liable. In the same way Rome must learn to look at what is best in us, and not specialise in our manifest shortcomings. But the real obstacle to reunion lies in our past history, and the more dispassionately we look for the truth in that past history, the more we shall be inclined to think that the obstacle ought to be regarded as an ugly monument, warning us against suspicion and unreasonableness. When both sides are convinced of this we can join hands and dance round it.

H.M.S.

Italy and the Reformation to 1550. By G. K. BROWN. (Blackwell). 18s.

THE longer we work at history, the more we are convinced of the necessity of a clearing-house by means of which one author might be aware of the researches of another in precisely the same field. Last year an American scholar, Mr. F. C. Church, published an important work on the "Italian Reformers, 1534-1564," and this year an English scholar, Mr. G. K. Brown, publishes a no less important work on "Italy and the Reformation to 1550." Here there is plain overlapping of the tasks of two writers who each seemed unaware that the other was labouring in practically the same field. To some degree we express our regrets to Mr. Brown that Mr. Church has so recently preceded him, and yet Mr. Brown's book is not in the least degree superfluous. Each author in not a few respects supplements the thought of the other, and as Mr. Brown's book induced us to take down again Mr. Church's, so we hope that Mr. Church's will also induce readers to take down Mr. Brown's for the purpose of the enlargement of their ideas. Mr. Brown is, in truth, a careful and conscientious historian who has explored the sources of his period with thoroughness, and that is to say much. No doubt there is always the danger that anyone who explores Italian archives tends to be submerged by the colossal extent of his material. Mr. Brown has confined himself to the printed first hand sources, and has clearly undertaken an extensive study of the second hand, and even with this limitation of his labours his task has been sufficiently extensive. On the whole, he has controlled his authorities, and they have not controlled him. In practice, this means that he has been obliged to set limits to his voracious reading, and we do him no injustice

if we deliberately state that the words asterisked in his bibliography mean much more to him than those left un-asterisked.

Mr. Church was mainly concerned with the reformers themselves while Mr. Brown is mainly concerned with the places of Reformation. Here his index renders him grave disservice. The reader in search of the outcome of the conceptions of Ochino will find scanty help in an index which simply states pp. 7, 17, 76, 86, 106, etc. Nor is this instance unique. In fact, the hasty reviewer is tempted to criticise this book and to criticise it severely for this fault, which suggests that Mr. Brown has not taken adequate trouble with his index and possibly not taken adequate trouble with his book, and this unfairness is inflicted by the author upon himself. No doubt the index, like the preface, is the last piece of work to be done in the composition of a book, and yet no part of his work enables the author better to correct the mistakes into which he falls and the repetitions which he is prone to commit.

Mr. Brown takes no little pains to bring before us the secular and the ecclesiastical background of the first half of the sixteenth century. From such general matters he proceeds to investigate the progress of the Reformation in the different Italian States. The strength of his book consists in the details he manages to give of the varying progress of the Reformation in these different States. By methods all his own, he once more drives home the conclusion that Italy was but a geographical expression. The two chapters on Milan and Mantua and on Modena and Ferrara dot the i's and cross the t's of this conclusion. Mr. Church has but little to say on the histories of the Italian States, and here Mr. Brown stands upon ground he has peculiarly made his own, for more than half his chapters concern the different States. In the account of the Reformation in Naples we searched eagerly for details of the Valdesian Movement and of the singular career of Vittoria Colonna, and upon both matters we found material for fresh thought. The views of Ochino are explained at length, and, given favouring circumstances, it is easy to see what a force he might have become in Italy.

In the penultimate chapter Mr. Church and Mr. Brown reach common ground, for both, especially the former, set forth at length the position occupied by the mediating theologians. Once more we feel a start of surprise as we realise how close was the approach of the Church of Rome to the Lutheran Church. The former had practically accepted the Confession of Augsburg. If the mediating theologians on both sides had had their way, it seems almost probable that the Confession of Augsburg would have been accepted by both Churches, and then how different

would the rest of the history of the sixteenth century have proved ! It is one of those tremendous ifs upon which it is impossible not to speculate.

R.H.M.

History of the Vulgate in England from Alcuin to Roger Bacon.
By HANS H. GLUNZ. (Cambridge University Press). 18s.

AT first sight it might seem as if here we had a highly technical volume dealing mainly with the text of some English manuscripts of the Vulgate gospels, and indeed this forms the main theme of this painstaking piece of work. The author has cast his net in the widest possible fashion, for he examines a large selection of Latin gospel manuscripts in English libraries, ranging in date from the eighth to the fourteenth century. The chief object of his quest has been the pursuit of an explanation of the alterations to which St. Jerome's text was liable throughout the Middle Ages. Our admiration for the worth of this work is so high that we feel patriotic pangs of regret to find that it has been left to a German lecturer in the University of Cologne to write it. The Germans have long been invading our legal territory, and we warmly welcome this invasion of the territory of the Vulgate in English manuscripts.

Technically, the appendices as well as the text contain much information upon the Canterbury MSS. X and O with a revised collation of Codex X ; the Gospel Commentaries of John the Scot and Remigius of Auxerre ; the Gospel Commentaries of Anselm of Laon ; the Gospel Glosses in the Harleian MS 1802 (about 1140, from Armagh) ; Herbert of Bosham's prefaces to his revision of the Great Gloss of Peter Lombard ; and specimens of three English Gospel Commentaries of the thirteenth century. Scholars will read these appendices with the care they deserve. In addition to them, we lavish a special meed of praise upon the index of MSS., the index of gospel passages, and the index of proper names. These are all examples of as complete thoroughness as the heart or the head could desire. Naturally Dr. Glunz is quite familiar with foreign authorities upon his subject, and we feel no surprise when he quotes Denifle's writings familiarly, plainly thinking that this great scholar's work contains the best contribution offered to the history of the mediaeval Vulgate. We are perhaps a little more inclined to express surprise when we see Dr. Glunz equally familiar with our own scholarship. For instance, he knows Mr. Brooke's fine book on "The English Church from the Conquest to the Reign of John," and notes precisely how this author appreciates the importance of the fact that

Lanfranc imported a Vulgate text which had been evolved in French schools, and according to the exegetical rules of the general Church.

The consideration of the attitude taken by Dr. Glunz to Mr. Brooke's book suggests that the history of the Vulgate in England lends itself to a more far-reaching treatment than that which will concern, let us say, the Dean of Christ Church or the Provost of King's College or the Master of Christ's College. For it is abundantly evident that the author is determined to lay bare the manifold ways in which his somewhat intractable material may be employed to illustrate the wider bearing of mediaeval thought. True, Dr. Glunz is definitely concerned with the manuscripts of the Vulgate, but he is no less concerned with the light that these texts throw upon the conditions of the mediæval mind. His thesis is akin to that of F. W. Maitland in his famous book on the Canon Law of England which he delighted to show was at bottom the Canon Law of Western Europe, and that William Lyndwood's "Provinciale" was not simply the law-book of the Church of England but the law-book of the whole western Church. Dr. Glunz, then, studies the history of the Vulgate in our country with the object of demonstrating that in this, as in other respects, we were in the true line of mediæval thought, and were not in the least provincial in our outlook. He seeks to show that the reform of the English monasteries under Dunstan and Æthelwold was more than a mere revival of the monastic ideal, and that this movement towards reform first made known in our land the new learning which was then the highest achievement of theological thought. He seeks to show that a century later the "orthodox" Vulgate text introduced into our Church the exact parallel to the other branches of ecclesiastical culture which, through the influence of Lanfranc, were obliged to conform to the continental standards. He seeks to show that the second half of the twelfth century saw the triumph of the Lombard's scholastic system in Paris, and, because of Becket's connexion with France, almost simultaneously in England. In fact, he seeks to show—and shows—that the interpenetration of European and English thought remained uninterrupted throughout the Middle Ages. Vulgate scholars will find this book indispensable, and so too will all who care to grasp the mind of the Middle Ages.

R.H.M.

Sidonius Apollinaris and his Age. By C. E. STEVENS. (Clarendon Press). 12s. 6d.

SIDONIUS APOLLINARIS was a nobleman and a bishop, a high official and a man of letters of the fifth century. He is a singularly

attractive character and Mr. Stevens decidedly feels his attraction. There is scholarship in his book and there is also—what we value much more—that instinctive sympathy which goes far towards the writing of a book that will compel the reader to peruse it. Born in 431, Sidonius lived to see his native land overrun by the barbarians and Odoacer king in Italy. His life, in truth, covers the final act of the great tragedy of Rome, the fall of the city that the ancient world deemed perpetual. To that world the most fundamental fact of its existence was the city where its heart most truly beat. Its citizen, Sidonius Apollinaris, is a splendid representative of a vanishing race, though he finds it hard to perceive the decline and fall of the imperial city. He does not find it quite so hard to see the rise and growth of the new religion which was to prove the bridge by which men passed from the ancient to the mediæval world. Rome as an Empire did not pass away till Napoleon's day in 1806, so extraordinarily difficult did men find it to grasp that it had at last passed away. Of course, the famous designation, the Holy Roman Empire, lent itself to Voltaire's sneer, but it also lent itself as a memorial to the permanence of Rome.

When did the Old World end and the New World begin? It is tempting to take the date A.D. 476 when Odoacer deposed the Emperor Romulus Augustulus and assumed the rule of Italy, which, in name, at any rate, remained united to the eastern half of the Empire. Has not Harnack termed St. Augustine the first modern man? With Mommsen Mr. Stevens also points out that the new Empire of Diocletian marked the passing of an epoch. Is the decisive date the conversion of Constantine or the founding of Constantinople? Or, is it the rise of the Dijon school of Gallo-Roman sculpture? No matter what view we take, Rome is sure to be written at large over it. Sidonius Apollinaris discerned signs of the period of transition, for, alive as he is to the birth of the new world, he is every whit as much alive to the death of the old. We to-day who are living through the death of an old world have perhaps more sympathy with the nobleman as well as with the bishop, as we note the catastrophe into which his lot was thrown. Mr. Stevens vividly realises it, and he affords considerable assistance towards our sharing his realisation.

The grave fascination of Rome for Sidonius Apollinaris is very transparent in these pages. So late as 467 Sidonius thinks of the Rome of Anthemius as "the house of law, the school of letters, the senate-house of dignities, the crown of the world, the native land of liberty, the peerless city of the whole world, in which none but barbarians and slaves are foreigners." To him, as to the thoughtful of his generation, Rome and civilisation

were synonymous terms, and he fought to the end of his life on behalf of any steps that might delay the ruin of his hopes. Nevertheless, he was by no means blind to the corruption of his day. "Among these calamities," he sorrowfully admits, "this funeral of the world, life has been death. In loyalty to our sires we have obeyed the laws that could not help us, and followed the ancient State along the path to ruin, and borne upon our shoulders the shadow of an Empire." Salvian too draws a serious picture of Roman vice. Still, the Church stood, which Sidonius described as

Betwixt the noisy crowd and rushing Arar ;
 To right the clatter of feet and hoofs of horses,
 And teamsters urging on their creaking waggons,
 To left the chorus of the straining boatmen,
 Timing their heavy oars to Christ the Pilot.
 While all the cliffs re-echo Alleluia,
 So chant ye farers by the way, ye boatmen ;
 This is the house of him whom all must honour ;
 Here all shall find the one way to salvation.

Mr. Stevens brings out the character of the man as well as that of the nobleman, and yet we lay down his book with a sense of pathos. Salvation lay before the Church, but what salvation lay before the State of Rome ? Sidonius casts about in all directions to watch the coming of its saviour. Was it possible that one might be found in Gaul ? Was he to be found in the great Avernian soldier ? And so in his despair he calls upon Avitus to "lift up the fallen." "Let no man love Rome better than thou." Sidonius was wrong, for he himself loved great Rome better than Avitus.

R.H.M.

The Christian and the Next War. By E. N. PORTER GOFF. (Allan). 2s. 6d.

THE aim of the author is to show how and where a war might arise, and to what type it would conform, and then he seeks to ascertain the duty of the Christian whenever such a catastrophe should take place. Most of us are quite able to foresee the conditions under which a fresh war might readily occur, and here we derive no particular help from Mr. Porter Goff. The duty of the Christian is resolved into the duty of the church or rather the churches, and they are to give their whole-hearted attention to the paramount question of peace.

R.H.M.

Historic Occasions in Westminster Abbey. Compiled by the VEN. V. F. STORR and DR. J. PERKINS. (Skeffington). 7s. 6d.

THE joint authors have had the happy idea of reprinting sermons preached on historic occasions in Westminster Abbey, and the execution of their intention has been no less happy than its conception. The first selected sermon is that preached on May 29, 1661, on the restoration of the monarchy, and the last is H. E. Ryle's on the right use of worship preached on the Sunday following the coronation of King George V and Queen Mary, September 10, 1911. Between these two addresses there are eleven others preached on different memorable occasions. What struck us forcibly is that those who stood nearest to the event were most in the dark as to its true significance, though indeed that is what we should expect. For instance, it never seems to occur to Heylin that the Restoration of 1660 was a revolution in disguise, in some respects more far-reaching than that of 1688. The sermons, however, possess the supreme quality of throwing light on contemporary opinion, and this is no mean merit. The biographical note on each preacher is distinctly helpful, and this we owe to the trained knowledge of Dr. J. Perkins, who possesses such intimate knowledge of the great Abbey.

R.H.M.

Adventures of Ideas. By ALFRED NORTH WHITEHEAD, Sc.D., LL.D., F.R.S., F.B.A., Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge, and Professor of Philosophy in Harvard University. (Cambridge : at the University Press). 12s. 6d. net.

IT is a pleasing impertinence to estimate the effects of an American environment on a mind and style so essentially of Cambridge (Eng.) as Professor Whitehead's. Among them must, we believe, be reckoned the frequent use of the dreadful substantive "urge," which one had supposed to be confined to second rate novelists on this side of the Atlantic at least. Pursuing the invidious research we may seem to detect traces of the same influence in occasional lapses into colloquialisms or, at other times, into flowery language, and in a certain tendency to pontificate : all of which seem alien to the austere impersonality which we expect from a Fellow of Trinity. There is moreover at least a suggestion that the American business man is *πάντων πραγμάτων μέτρον*. It is a more serious impertinence for one whose mathematics are *nil* and whose philosophy is at best that of Oxford in the eighties, to criticise, however respectfully, the methods and conclusions of an expert who shows himself equally at home with Plato and Einstein, and with all that lies between them in the realm of ideas.

The utmost that can be done is for the reviewer to describe the reactions of such a mind as his own to these high matters for the benefit of readers who labour under similar disabilities. The quality in Professor Whitehead which strikes and surprises him at the outset is his optimism. On page 13 he reads "Freedom and Equality constitute an inevitable presupposition for modern political thought"; and he rubs his eyes, for he supposed he was living in a time when the ideal of personal liberty has ceased to receive so much as lip service, and in practice the individual is taxed and regimented on a scale and with a thoroughness that the world has never known. Stalin, he murmurs in perplexity; Mussolini, Hitler: are these the apostles of freedom and equality, and of a tender respect for the human soul?

Again Professor Whitehead is fully justified in his conclusion that the progress of technology is an important factor in the advance of civilisation: but, in a book of this kind which deals so largely with the present and future of the human race, it is remarkable that he should appear to ignore the paradoxical situation in which plenty has come to be the enemy of prosperity, and over-production is the too fruitful parent of unemployment and distress. It would be too much to expect him to solve off-hand the problems which divide and perplex our leading economists: but he might at least have envisaged technology in its latest aspect as a Sphinx which menacingly demands its Oedipus. We still condemn the frame breakers of the last century as reactionaries; but we have to admit that the results which they dimly foresaw are alarmingly real. As he advances through the book, the reader who is not forearmed with a good measure of science and philosophy will often find himself out of his depth: but he will feel the ground under his feet again when he reaches the chapter in which Professor Whitehead deals with Christianity. We may disagree with his conclusions, and regard his ideal for the future of protestantism as Utopian; but we are bound to acknowledge and welcome his generous appreciation of the Church's unique service to civilisation, and of the metaphysical soundness of much Christian theology.¹ The whole of Chapter X and especially Section III are illuminating and stimulating to any serious thinker on religious problems and although Professor Whitehead appears to be resolutely protestant in his outlook, there is little to disturb and much to inspire the most convinced Catholic in such passages as the following:

The essence of Christianity is the appeal of the life of Christ as a revelation of the nature of God, and of his agency

¹ p. 214.

in the world . . . There can be no doubt as to what elements in the record have evoked a response from all that is best in human nature. The Mother, the Child, and the bare manger : the lowly man, homeless and self forgetful, with his message of peace, love and sympathy : the suffering, the agony, the tender words as life ebbed, the final despair : and the whole with the authority of supreme victory.

or again :

The task of Theology is to show how the world is founded on something beyond mere transient fact, and how it issues in something beyond the perishing of occasions.

After the barren aridities of much nineteenth century materialism it is refreshing to find a man of Professor Whitehead's scientific status and authority basing the hope of the world on an interpretation of Christianity even though it may in some ways differ from our own interpretation.

All that has been here written gives a very imperfect survey of *Adventures of Ideas* : and probably shows a very imperfect grasp of the questions which the author raises and the answers he suggests. In the concluding chapters there is only space for a reference to the interesting demonstration of the relation of mathematical ratios to beauty of form, which, if it be carried on from its first and obvious application to architecture, promises a ground for a science of aesthetics.

With regard to the whole book and its two predecessors crabbed age may fairly and honestly express a hope that the active and curious mind of the younger generation may find in them many springs of intellectual stimulus and of practical endeavours towards a broader and nobler life.

J.H.F.P.

Modern Thought on Trial. By KENNETH INGRAM. (Philip Allan).
8s. 6d. net.

WE observe that in the case of this book that odd little puff preliminary which publishers find it necessary to print on the dust-cover is, for once, both true and pertinent. In Part I Mr. Ingram gives a frank, judicial, and sympathetic survey of mental and moral phenomena which are apparent in the younger generation of English men and women. And it is the sympathy that counts. Mr. Ingram does not throw up his hands and say How shocking : but tries, with considerable success, to find out why the old postulates of Religion and Morals are so widely discounted or rejected by young people. He is extremely frank on the one

hand in his criticism of the Victorian and Edwardian "codes," and of the War time hysteria and the "orgy of ferocious victory exhibitionism," and, on the other hand, he does not attach any exaggerated importance to what he calls the Bertrand Russell Clique. He sees that the causes of unsettlement are deeper and wider, and spring from a general disillusionment which has tried the old standards, and often, not unreasonably, found them wanting. Altogether he is in agreement with the *data* of the younger generation, though in many cases he cannot follow them to their conclusions.

Mr. Ingram does himself less than justice by the title he has given to his Part II. It is something far more positive and valuable than a criticism of modern thought, or a judgement of its exponents—and can be more fairly described as a serious attempt to build upon the solid parts of what looks like the ruins of pre-war morality and religion a new home, secure and beautiful, for those who come after. The chapter on the Future of Morals is an example of his method. He regards the old *tabus* and inhibitions as gone for good in both senses of the word ; and looks for a new order of thought in sexual relations, in which liberty will be the natural ally of self-control and good taste. When he is speaking of the Future of Religion, Mr. Ingram has the courage and commonsense to smile at the criticism which pretends that it has annihilated the gospel story and all that it involves, and calls its attitude "a curiously old-fashioned, warped conventionalism." But on the next page he has a passage which is worth quoting at length, because, when it is compared with a quotation taken from Professor Whitehead's book, it shows a resemblance which is striking and to be welcomed :

If the record had no historical foundation it would suffer, though its value would not be entirely destroyed. For the historical element is the less important fixture. The spiritual values which Christ preached are the more vital factor. And there is also an importance in the symbolical significance of the incidents of the story. I doubt whether any conception has a more complete affinity to the sympathies of the human race than that of the Son of God being born an outcast in a manger, lying in his Mother's lap as a helpless infant, sweating under the Syrian sun, enduring pain and ignominy, dying as a criminal between two criminals, and conquering through his defeat.¹

J.H.F.P.

¹ p. 175. *cf. Adventures of Ideas*, p. 214.

The Gospel of Modernism. By the REV. R. D. RICHARDSON, Vicar of Four Oaks. (Skeffington). 3s. 6d. net.

It is a cruel thing to be wounded in the house of a friend : and the Bishop of Birmingham in his foreword to the *Gospel of Modernism* arms the captious critic with the expressive colloquialism, "flat-trap stuff," which is almost irresistible. It is true that he applies it to the misguided people who dislike the idea that bishops are descended from monkeys : but after all, it might be a two-edged weapon.

The candid critic however resists temptation and finds in Mr. Richardson's book, much that is edifying, something that is amusing, and not a little that is pathetic.

Bliss is it in that dawn (*i.e.* of Modernism) to be alive
But to be young is very Heaven

sings Mr. Richardson : and he is still young enough to be full of the easy optimism which believes that the Modernists have a gospel for humanity, and the characteristic cocksureness which claims a monopoly of intellectual honesty for the school of which he is one of the rising hopes. Nevertheless his book fairly earns the respect which is due to sincerity and singleness of mind, and the earnest desire to impart the good news which he is convinced that he has received. The chapters on the history and literature of Israel are written in a lively and attractive style, and contain little that would disturb any fairly well-read and intelligent Catholic. And in his presentation of the Life, Teaching, and Person of Jesus he is on the whole surprisingly orthodox, but, in the light of what he has been saying in Chapter V, quite illogical. It is surely illogical to tell us that the gospel story is a patchwork of questionable documents, and has been misread and misinterpreted by the Church for nineteen centuries, so that it is safe to discard, as historically false, anything in it which is not approved by what is rather a nineteenth than a twentieth century mentality : and then to maintain that his subjective reactions to what he chooses to select from the Gospels present an authentic picture of One for whom he claims our unhesitating and unreserved allegiance. He cannot have it both ways : and, human nature being what it is, it does not seem likely that a Gospel based on denials and conjecture will have the quality needed to turn the sinner from the error of his way, and confirm the simple and the faint-hearted.

A comparison of the main thesis of the *Gospel of Modernism* with some passages in Dr. Whitehead's *Adventure of Ideas* is instructive and significant ; and may help the reader to understand the Professor's severe judgement of Liberal Protestantism.

J.H.F.P.

The Shi'ite Religion : A History of Islam in Persia and Irak. By DWIGHT M. DONALDSON, D.D., Ph.D., Mashhad, Persia. (Luzac & Co.: 1933).

THIS is the sixth volume in Luzac's Oriental Religions Series ; and perhaps the first book, at any rate in English, to attempt to deal succinctly with the whole problem of the Shiis. The author is a missionary of the American Presbyterian Mission in Persia, and writes from Mashhad, one of the sacred cities of Shiite Islam. He has lived for many years amongst those whom he seeks to interpret.

The thirty-three chapters in this book trace the history of Shiitism from the days of 'Ali, cousin and son-in-law of Muhammad, who in the eyes of Persia and to a certain extent Irak, was the first real Amir ul Mu'minin, right up to the more recent days of Abdul Baha and Subhy Ezel. Shiitism is an effort to answer the vexed question as to whether Muhammad appointed any successor, and what should constitute the rights and duties of the one so appointed.

In this case it is answered in the affirmative to the effect that Muhammad designated 'Ali as his successor, while history shows that for a considerable number of the faithful he "and his seed after him" came to be regarded as the Imams or leaders of the people. Those who came before 'Ali in the Khalifate were usurpers, who, though he may have been the fourth Khalifa historically, was actually the first Imam. He was followed by his two sons, one of whom abdicated while the other was slain in battle on the field of Kerbela, a death that has stirred the imagination of thousands for thirteen centuries with its annual commemoration. Politics have of course played their full part in the story. If the Sunnite cause was espoused by the Umayyad rulers in Damascus, who actually had very little religion of any sort about them : Shiitism gave an opportunity for championship first to the Abbasids and later to the Buwaihids. With the death of Hussain three of the Imams had passed away, but there were nine to come, although one Shiite offshoot claimed that there were only seven in all. The "twelvers" however have always been in the ascendancy, but the last of these Imams went into a retirement from which he has never returned, although four agents followed him ; after which ideas of "carrying on" until his reappearance seem to have lapsed for the best part of a millennium. It was largely because of this theory of the hidden Imam that the Shaikhis and Bahais took their rise. History proved that it was as necessary for the Shiis as for the Sunnis to substantiate their doctrines, and so, if the latter had books of Traditions to supplement the dicta of the Qur'an, the same was true of the Shiis. If according to Sun-

nite thinking it became needful to produce a doctrine of the person of Muhammad, the Shiis would seem to have gone further, attributing "sinlessness" to all the holders of the Imamate, a dogma unsupported by the Canonical books of Jews, Muhammadans and Christians.

These and other features of Shiitism are examined and discussed by Dr. Donaldson, who also has chapters dealing with significance of the Shiite shrines. He has given us in short an interesting and well-documented book (there are twelve pages of Bibliography) on an intricate subject.

E.F.F.B.

An Introduction to the Sociology of Islam. By REUBEN LEVY, M.A. : Lecturer in Persian in the University of Cambridge. Vol. II. (London : Williams and Norgate for Herbert Spencer's Trustees).

"SOCIOLOGY," says the Dictionary, "deals with all the phenomena of society"; and there is no doubt that in these two volumes Mr. Levy has taken the dictionary explanation of the term at its widest. The wealth of authorities is just as abundant in Vol. II, as in its predecessor. The dozen pages of bibliography speak for themselves. The author tells us where to go after we have digested his own survey. The second volume covers a wider field than the first, embracing not only a discussion of the religious and moral tenets of Islam, but provincial government, military organisation and scientific ideas. The chapter dealing with this last subject is the closing one, and we think will prove the most interesting, perhaps especially the description of the work of the *Ikhwan al-Safa*, "the Brethren of Purity," a society "which flourished at Basra in the latter part of the tenth century." Due mention is made of other great names, Avicenna, Ibn Khaldun, Al Ghazali. In the chapter on the soldiers room is found for a few paragraphs on the Arab or Islamic navies, the chief interest in matters nautical having been taken in Spain, which country must have been largely responsible for passing on to other European languages the various sea terms, that started life in their Arabic dress in the waters of the Mediterranean. There is altogether a quantity of material in this chapter that is not available so compactly elsewhere in English. There are other interesting pieces of information scattered all over the volume, as that *siyasa* (politics), a word continually on the tongue of the easterner who uses Arabic, comes popularly, according to Maqixi, from the Mongol *Yasa*, or code of Laws, introduced by a son of the famous Chingiz Khan. (Page 171). "How real the life beyond can appear to a believer may be illustrated by the story . . . of the merchant whose credit terms per-

mitted repayment in the next world" (Page 53). Or again the reader will find information regarding commerce, painting ("the worst punishment on the day of Resurrection will be that meted out to painters"), taxes due from believers and unbelievers, the intercourse in days gone by between European monarchs and Islamic potentates, the development of military tactics, "Indian numerals," predestination and epidemics. There is something for "most anybody" in the "Sociology of Islam."

E.F.F.B.

Jesus : A New Outline and Estimate. By A. C. BOUQUET, D.D. (Heffer). 6s.

READERS of the *Church Quarterly Review* already know of the series of modern hand-books on religion which Dr. Bouquet is writing. In noticing the second of the series in the April issue the present reviewer remarked : "If the other six are as interesting and constructive as this, the author is doing the intelligent public a rare service in writing them." The volume now under review is the sixth, and is intended to be regarded as central. Reluctantly we are compelled to express considerable disappointment, for that important element of constructiveness is here much less apparent. The author writes well and lucidly, but to us at least he has failed to carry conviction, though we started with every expectation of his doing so. If there is such a person as the "modern man," for whom Dr. Bouquet writes, we are convinced that he is not so sceptical as the author supposes—or at least that when he accepts Christianity he will desire a more full-blooded version of it than Dr. Bouquet supplies. The Catholic doctrine of the Incarnation (as we understand it) is referred to as a "catastrophic and intrusionary theory of christology" (p. 165). As regards the Virgin Birth, "there seems no reason why a modern Christian should not believe that both Joseph and Mary, though fully married, enjoyed certain genuine experiences of a deeply spiritual character in connection with the conception and birth of their first-born" (pp. 129 f). [Frankly we do not know what is meant here.] The emptiness or otherwise of the tomb on the third day is left an open question, and "no modern Christian need regard himself as burdened with the traditional form of the belief in the Second Coming" (p. 114). It is admitted that Jesus and other saints cured disease by mental influence, but the feeding of multitudes and even the walking on the sea are regarded as unhistorical, though our Lord's personality "transmuted ordinary things into supernatural blessings" (p. 120). The idea of Christ as mediator "must surely be abandoned" (p. 199), and a sacerdotal priesthood "exists because it is desired, not because certain theoretical principles

demand it" (p. 258). We wonder how many "modern-minded congregations" (p. 205) really exist or are likely to exist, and whether "a cleansed and simplified and honest religion" (p. 270) will ever provide a solution to the urgent problems of the world to-day.

F.H.

The Life and Teaching of Jesus Christ. By CHARLES E. RAVEN, D.D., and ELEANOR RAVEN. (Cambridge University Press). 4s. 6d.

THIS is an exceptionally valuable little book, specially useful for the educated layman who wishes to study the Gospels intelligently in the light of modern knowledge. The first half of the book sets forth in condensed form the main facts with regard to religious and social conditions in Palestine in our Lord's day, and the evidence about his life and teaching ; and also gives an introduction to the chief sources of our knowledge of him. This is done with admirable clarity, and the fact that the essay is interesting reading in spite of being so concentrated reveals the sure hand of real scholarship. In the second half of the book the actual text of the Gospels is printed out in the Revised Version—first St. Mark, then "Q"; and afterwards certain passages from St. Luke, St. Matthew and St. John. There is no commentary, but references are given to the introduction and there are a few brief notes. The authors' object is "to combine the advantages of the usual 'Life of Christ' with those of a source-book ; and to encourage readers to study the original documents for themselves." They have certainly succeeded in their undertaking.

F.H.

Memorials upon Several Occasions. (A. R. Mowbray & Co., Ltd.).

THE section of the Revised Prayer Book entitled *Occasional Prayers and Thanksgivings* is both the most used and the least satisfactory part of that work. Among the most needed, the first two of the three prayers for missions and the prayer for hospitals and infirmaries are as clumsy examples of "committee" writing as could well be found. Further the priest will wish to lead his people's prayers concerning many matters for which the Revised Book makes no provision. The permission to use a bidding followed by silent prayer is not always appropriate. For instance it would be quite unsuitable at the choir offices in a Cathedral church.

This book, *Memorials upon Several Occasions*, is felicitous

in its use of ancient sources, while the new prayers contributed by the anonymous editor, though it is inevitable that they should sometimes compare unfavourably with the language of Cranmer, are the work of a man possessing acquaintance with liturgical science, and a genuine capacity for writing English prose. The book is already authorised in seventeen English dioceses. It is to be hoped that the list will be soon extended. Used with discretion and restraint these prayers will provide a valuable enrichment of public worship.

P.U.

PERIODICALS.

The Journal of Theological Studies (Vol. XXXIV. No. 136. October, 1933. Milford). A. L. Williams : The Date of the Epistle of Barnabas. R. H. Connolly : 'Didache and Diatessaron.' G. A. Cooke : The Earth from the Eighth Heaven. A Note on Dante, *Paradiso*, xxii, 133-154. M. L. W. Laistner : Source-marks in Bede MSS. E. Francheschini : Grosseteste's Translation of the 'Prologos' and 'Scholia' of Maximus to the Writings of the Pseudo-Dionysius Areopagita. F. C. Burkitt : (1) The Chester Beatty Papyri ; (2) On 2 Kings, xix, 26, 27 ; (3) Capernaum, Capharnaum : Maththaios, Matthaios. W. L. Barnes : On Ezekiel ii, 4. G. R. Driver : Studies in the Vocabulary of the O.T., VI. R. Gardis : Critical Notes on the Blessing of Moses. P. L. Hedley : The Georgian Fragments of Jeremiah. D. de Bruyne : Deux Citations apocryphes de l'Apôtre Pierre [M.S. Brit. Mus. Royal, 7, C. 4 'Liber Scintillarum' c. 63 ; MS. Zurich c. 64, p. 63v]. F. R. Tennant : Barnes 'Scientific Theory and Religion' (5 pp.) ; Chestov 'In Job's Balances' ; Hicks 'Berkeley.' A. Nairne : Festugière 'L'Idéal religieux des Grecs et l'Evangile.' I. B. Horner : Ranade 'Indian Mysticism.' R. L. Barnes : Fr. Bruno 'St. John of the Cross.' C. A. Scott : Goguel 'The Life of Jesus' [E.T.] and 'La Foi à la Résurrection de Jésus' ; Purinton 'The Re-interpretation of Jesus in the N.T.' G. A. Cooke : Robinson and Oesterley 'History of Israel.' S. Cave : Barth 'The Epistle to the Romans [E.T.]' (4 pp.). G. R. Driver : Hertzberg 'Der Prediger (Qohelet)' ; A New Series of Rabbinic Texts [edd. Kittel and Marmorstein]. W. E. Barnes : 'Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft', N.F. IX, 1-4. J. F. B[ethune]-B[aker] : Carpenter 'Church and People' ; Williams and Harris (edd.) 'Northern Catholicism' ; Knox and Vidler 'The Development of Modern Catholicism' ; von Loewenich 'Das Johannes-Verständnis im zweiten Jahrhundert' ; Granger 'Legal Status of Labour in the N.T.' ; Wilbur 'The Two Treatises of Servetus on the Trinity' ; Robinson 'Christianity is Pacifism' ; Andrews 'Christ in the Silence' ; M. L. W. Laistner : Macdonald 'Authority and Reason in the Early Middle Ages' (very critical). F. C. Burkitt : Lake and New 'Six Collations of N.T. MSS.' A. Souter : Lehmann 'Mitteilungen aus Handschriften' ; Boon and Lefort 'Pachomiana Latina' ; Holl 'Epiphanius.'

The Churchman (Vol. XLVII. No. 4. October, 1933. London, E.C.4 : Dean Wace House). A. J. Tait : Our Anglican Heritage [sermon]. Right Rev. E. A. Knox : A Mid-Victorian Home. J. Knipe : How the Reformation began in England. Ven. W. L. Paige-Cox : St. Mary's Loch revisited. F. Bate : The Bishop of London's Overseas Jurisdiction. F. R. M. Hitchcock : The Papal Bulls for the Invasions of England and Ireland. H. Smith : Church Briefs. F. S. Keay : The Dutch Reformed Church. Leslie 'Ossory Churches and Parishes.' A. J. Tait : Mackean 'The Eucharistic Doctrine of the Oxford Movement.' F. R. M. Hitchcock : Patterson 'The Conception of God in the Philosophy of Aquinas' (3½ pp.). Macdonald 'Authority and Reason.' Taylor 'Formation of the Gospel Tradition.' Inskip 'Evangelical Influence in English Life.' Malden 'The Roman Catholic Church and the Church of England.' Kennett 'Ancient Hebrew Social Life and Custom.' Davies 'The Heart of the Bible, I.' Howard 'The Seventh and Sixth Century Prophets.' Marston 'The New Knowledge about the O.T.' Edwards 'John Wesley and the XVIIIth Century.' Buxton 'William Wilberforce.' Simpson 'The Communion of the Lord's Supper.'

The Modern Churchman (Vol. XXIII. Nos. 5-7. October, 1933. Oxford : Blackwell). Very Rev. W. R. Inge : The Church of the N.T. S. Mc-

Comb : The Christian Church as a Divine Fellowship. H. Anson : Creative Worship. J. S. Bezzant : The Authority of the Christian Church, its Basis and Justification. J. M. Creed : The Authority . . . in Doctrine. G. L. H. Harvey : The Authority . . . in Ethics. M. T. Dunlop : The Authority . . . in Economic, Industrial and Political Problems. M. V. C. Jeffreys : The Christian Church and Education in the Day Schools. C. F. Russell : The Christian Church and Education in the Public Schools. J. P. Hodges : . . . and Education in the Parish. W. W. Longford : The Character and Call of the Church of England in Relation to Roman Catholicism. R. D. Richardson : . . . in Relation to Modernism. N. Sykes : . . . in Relation to the State.

Laudate (Vol. XI. No. 43. September, 1933. Burnham, Bucks : Nashdom Abbey). B. Clements : Duty towards God. H. J. W. Tillyard : Byzantine Music at the End of the Middle Ages. Fr. Gr. : Nordic Spirituality. F. J. E. Raby : A Spanish Gentleman [Prudentius]. H. A. Hodges : Nicolai Hartmann's 'Ethics', I. Ven. J. H. F. Peile : Jordan 'Religious Toleration in England'; Hunt 'Calvin.' R. H. Thouless : Hollingworth 'Abnormal Psychology' (critical). F. H. Smith : James 'Origins of Sacrifice.' Frost 'Priesthood and Prayer.' Kirk 'Marriage and Divorce' (laudatory). Mortimer 'Gambling.' Hodgson 'Eugenics' (critical).

The Congregational Quarterly (Vol. XI. No. 4. October, 1933. London, E.C.4 : Memorial Hall). K. L. Parry : Baptism—Congregational Theory and Practice. E. B. Storr : Charles Bradlaugh. F. H. Ballard : Public Worship. E. L. Allen : Adventure in Worship. B. M. Peake : The Reform of Divine Worship. W. B. Selbie : Free Church Worship. W. Band : Reflections from Peiping, July, 1933. W. W. Willard : The Fundamental Heresy. R. Macintosh : Church Union—Hopes and Cautions. A. Small : The Guidance of God. A. G. Cucknow : Truth and Authority. S. Cave : Barth 'Epistle to the Romans' [E.T.]. C. H. Dodd : Mackinnon 'The Gospel in the Early Church.' W. B. Selbie : Borchert 'The Original Jesus'; Mackenzie 'The Christ of the Christian Faith' (critical); Maret 'Sacraments of Simple Folk'; Bailey 'Phases in the Religion of Ancient Rome.' J. Murphy : Laing 'Hume'; Hicks 'Berkeley.' A. Souter : Glunz 'The Vulgate in England.' B. L. Manning : Macdonald 'Authority and Reason' (favourable); Thompson 'The Carthusian Order in England' (a 'most substantial, learned, and informing volume'). R. S. Franks : Mackean 'The Eucharistic Doctrine of the Oxford Movement.' Seventh Theological Conference of Congregationalists, Cambridge, July 10-14, 1933. Papers on 'The Self-Revelation of God.' The Concept of Self-Revelation (J. Short). The Self-Revelation of God in Personality (C. L. Raven). In Conscience (F. Wrigley). In Inanimate Matter (E. Cunningham). In Animate Nature (B. L. Woolf). In Holy Men (F. Lenwood). In Jesus Christ (A. C. Bouquet).

The Expository Times (Vol. XLIV. No. 12. Vol. XLV. No. 1. September-October, 1933. Edinburgh : T. & T. Clark). J. Reid : Second Corinthians. J. S. MacArthur : The Oxford Movement and the Training of the Anglican Clergy. J. H. Maclean : St. Paul at Athens. T. C. Gordon : A New Date for Jeremiah [c. 616 B.C.]. Dearmer (ed.) 'Christianity and the Crisis.' Davies 'The Heart of the Bible, I' Glunz 'The Vulgate in England from Alcuin to Roger Bacon.' Borchert 'The Original Jesus.' Williams (ed.) 'Northern Catholicism.' Isaacs 'Hebrews.' Mackean 'Eucharistic Doctrine of the Oxford Movement.' October. N. P. Williams : Romans. T. H. Hughes : Some Problems raised by the New Psychology. H. E. Bryant : Guidance. S. Daiches : Ps. cxxvii, 2. A New Explanation. J. B. Russell : The Doctrine of the Inner Light in the 'Apology' of Robert Barclay. A. E. Morris : 1 Cor., xv, 3-4. R. Hughes : Acts xiii, 13. J. H. M. Dabb : Luke v, 26. R. G. Dunbar : Submerged Aorists. Knudson : Doctrine of Redemption. J. E.

McFadyen : Recent Foreign Theology. W. Manson : Michel 'Prophet und Märtyrer.'

The Quarterly Review (No. 518. October, 1933. John Murray). After the Verdict. Sir Ian Malcolm : Chamberlain. The Second Phase. W. E. D. Allen : The Fascist Idea in Britain. S. Wood : Leeuwenhoek and his 'Little Beasties.' H. V. Redman : Anglophobia in Japan. C. F. Rogers : The Clergy and Social Science. O. Rutter : The Vindication of William Bligh. Blue Shirts and the I.R.A. W. F. Watson : The Machine and its Purpose. G. Thomas : John Wesley. Ferrero on War. Some Aspects of Disarmament. Inge 'God and the Astronomers.' Benson 'King Edward VII.' Hyde 'The Rise of Castlereagh.' Matheson 'Life of Henry Dundas.' Hunt 'Mediaeval Studies.' Boas 'Introduction to Tudor Drama.' Woodhouse 'King Agis of Sparta.' Masefield 'The Conway.'

Internationale Kirchliche Zeitschrift (Vol. XXIII. No. 3. July-September, 1933. Bern : Stämpfli et Cie). Die Gnadenlehre in der orthodoxen morgenländischen Kirche, II. H. Hurry : Die Oxfordbewegung. Die Weltkonferenz für Glauben und Verfassung. Eine Verständigung zwischen Vertretern der orthodoxen Kirchen Bulgariens und Jugoslaviens. Eine Balkankonferenz. Sellin 'Abschaffung des A.T. Brunner 'Das Gebot und die Ordnungen.'

Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft (Vol. XXXIII. Nos. 2-3. 1933. Giessen : Töpelmann). S. Mowinckel : Die Vorstellungen des Spätjudentums von heiligen Geist als Fürsprecher und der johanneische Paraklet. H. Koch : Zu ps-Titus 'De dispositione Sanctimonii.' L. Rost : Zu Neuauflage der Damaskusschrift in den Kleinen Texten. E. V. Dobschütz : Zur Liste der N.T.-lichen Handschriften, IV. H. Ljungvik : Zum Romäerbrief iii, 7-8. O. Schaefer : Der Sinn der Rede Jesu von den vielen Wohnungen in seines Vaters Hause und von dem Weg zu ihm (Joh. xiv, 1-7). K. Petersen : Zu den Speisungs—und Abendwahlsberichten. Rauer 'Origenes Werke, IX.'

Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche (Vol. XIV. No. 3. 1933. Tübingen : Mohr [Siebeck]). R. Pauus : Theologie und Religionsphilosophie. F. Traub : Die neue Fassung der Barthischen Dogmatik. H. Raillard : Die Stellung der Moral und Leben des Christen nach Zinzendorf. H. Benckert : Isaak August Dorner's 'Pisteologie.' Siegfried 'Das Wort und die Existenz' (4 pp.). F. Kattenbusch : Dittrich 'Geschichte der Ethik.'

Teologisk Tidsskrift (Vol. IV. No. 3. 1933. Copenhagen : Gad). R. Prenter : Martin Heideggers Filosofi og Teologien. R. Thomsen : Engelsk Kirkeliv i 1932. F. Hvidberg : Bertholet 'Götterspaltung und Göttervereinigung'; Baumgartner 'Israelitische und Altorientalische Weisheit.' M. Nehendam : Webb 'Religious Thought in England from 1850.' V. Lindegaard-Petersen : Gounette 'Aux Sources de Vie.'

The International Review of Missions (Vol. XXII. No. 88. October, 1933. Milford). R. Rees : Evangelism in China. S. S. Cohon : The Jew and Christian Evangelization. E. Bevan : Considerations on a Complaint regarding Christian Propaganda among Jews. J. H. Oldham : Prof. Brunner on the Christian Ethic, IV. The Community of Faith. A. Werner : Colenso of Natal. E. R. Morgan : The Study of Church History in Relation to Christian Missions. Egypt and Religious Liberty. K. B. Westman : Missions and Nationalism. Sir A. T. Wilson : Donaldson 'The Shi'ite Religion' (laudatory). G. van der Leeuw : Schuurman 'Mystik und Glaube im Zusammenhang mit der Mission auf Java.' H. W. Schomerus : Frick 'Das Evangelium u. die Religionen'; Thompson 'The Word of the Cross to Hindus.' A. E. Garvie : Beaden 'Modern Tendencies in World Religions'; Speer 'The Finality of Jesus Christ.' H. T. Silcock : Pollard 'China's Foreign Relations, 1917-31.' K. S. Latourette : Dr. Richter's Missionary History, Vol. V. A. H. Clark :

Coatman 'Years of Destiny. India 1926-32.' W. Paton : Zacharias 'Renaescent India.' L. Hodous : Harvey 'The Mind of China.'

The Church Overseas (Vol. VI. No. 24. October, 1933. Westminster, S.W.1 : Church House). O. Hardman : The Uniqueness of Christianity. J. W. Parkes : The Nature of Anti-Semitism. K. Miyazawa : The Gospels in Japan. Early References. A. F. Matthew : Slavery in Abyssinia. W. T. Williams : The Need for Christian Unity in North India. F. E. Biggart : The Ministry of Women. Christianity or Communism : Is History Repeating Itself ? (By a C.M.S. Missionary). News from the Dioceses. Quarterly Survey. S. H. Biddlecombe : Modern Persia. W. W. Cash : Wensinck 'The Muslim Creed.' Sir A. T. Wilson : Richards 'The Open Road in Persia.' W. L. S. Holland : Thompson 'The Word of the Cross to Hindus.' H. U. W. Stanton : Richards 'The Religion of the Baha'is'. A. W. Norton : Foster 'The Chinese Church in Action.'

BOOKS RECEIVED.

BIBLICAL.

DAVIES, J. B. T.—*The Heart of the Bible*, Vol. III, 247 pp. (Allen & Unwin). 5s.

KENNETT., R. H.—*The Church of Israel*, 249 pp. (Cambridge Univ. Press). 12s. 6d.

STOCK, V.—*The Life of Christ*, 230 pp. (Methuen). 6s.

CARRINGTON, P.—*The Road to Jerusalem*, 131 pp. (S.P.C.K.). 3s. 6d.

EDWARDS, E.—*Stories about Jesus*, 74 pp. (John Bale & Danielsson). 2s. 6d.

HILL, H. ERSKINE.—*Studies in the Gospel of St. John*, 96 pp. (Elliot Stock). 2s. 6d.

HOLZHEISTER, U.—*Chronologia Vitae Christi*, 246 pp. (Pontifical Biblical Institute, Rome). 16 lire.

VANNUTELLI, P.—*Quaestiones de Synopticis Evangelii*, 105 pp. (Fr. Ferrari : Via dei Cestari, 2 ; Rome).

HISTORICAL.

WOODS, E. S., and MACNUTT, F. B.—*Theodore, Bishop of Winchester*, 399 pp. (S.P.C.K.). 7s. 6d.

MCLACHLAN, H.—*The Unitarian Movement in the Religious Life of England*. 317 pp. (Allen & Unwin). 10s. 6d.

DANBY, H.—*The Mishnah*, 844 pp. (Clarendon Press). 18s.

TATLOW, T.—*The Story of the Student Christian Movement*, 944 pp. (S.C.M. Press). 12s. 6d.

PHILLIPS, W. A.—*History of the Church of Ireland*, Vol. I, 437 pp. (Oxford Univ. Press). 3 vols., 31s. 6d.

BROWNE, L. E.—*The Eclipse of Christianity in Asia*, 198 pp. (Cambridge Univ. Press). 10s. 6d.

COTTON, P.—*From Sabbath to Sunday*, 184 pp. (Times Publishing Co., Bethlehem, Pa.).

KNOOP, D., and JONES, G. P.—*The Mediaeval Mason*, 294 pp. (Manchester Univ. Press). 12s. 6d.

ROSS, J. E.—*John Henry Newman*, 254 pp. (Allen & Unwin). 7s. 6d.

CONWAY, R. S.—*Ancient Italy and Modern Religion*, 150 pp. (Cambridge Univ. Press). 10s. 6d.

JAMES, E. O.—*Christian Myth and Ritual*, 345 pp. (John Murray), 12s.

BROWN, G. K.—*Italy and the Reformation to 1550*. (Blackwell). 18s. See Review.

STORR, V. F., and PERKINS, J., edited by—*Historic Occasions in Westminster Abbey*. (Skeffington). 7s. 6d. See Review.

PHILOSOPHICAL AND THEOLOGICAL.

GRENSTED, L. W.—*The Person of Christ*, 292 pp. (Nisbet). 10s. 6d.

JOAD, C. E. M.—*Counter Attack from the East*, 269 pp. (Allen & Unwin). 7s. 6d. See Review.

VISSER 'T HOOFT, W. A.—*Anglo-Catholicism and Orthodoxy*, 175 pp. (S.C.M. Press). 5s.

JALLAND, T. G.—*This Our Sacrifice*, 157 pp. (Mowbray). 6s.

MATTHEWS, W. R.—*Essays in Construction*, 243 pp. (Nisbet). 7s. 6d.

MERCIER, L. J. A.—*The Challenge of Humanism*, 288 pp. (Oxford Univ. Press). 10s. 6d.

HUGHES, T. H.—*The New Psychology and Religious Experience*, 332 pp. (Allen & Unwin). 10s. 6d.

COLLINGWOOD, R. G.—*An Essay on Philosophical Method*, 227 pp. (Clarendon Press). 10s.

CAMFIELD, F. W.—*Revelation and the Holy Spirit*. 300 pp. (Elliot Stock). 7s. 6d.

BOUQUET, A. C.—*Man and Deity*, 451 pp. (Heffer). 7s. 6d.

INGRAM, K.—*Modern Thought on Trial*. (Philip Allan). 8s. 6d. See Review.

RICHARDSON, R. D.—*The Gospel of Modernism*. (Skeffington). 3s. 6d. See Review.

DEVOTIONAL, LITURGICAL, ETC.

Memorials upon Several Occasions, 115 pp. (Mowbray). See Review.

GARDNER, C.—*Intercession*, 96 pp. (S.C.M. Press). 1s.

HUNTINGTON, J. O. S., and TIEDEMAN, K.—*The School of the Eternal*, 208 pp. (Centenary Press). 3s. 6d.

DONOVAN, M., and KIRTLAND, C. T.—*Outline of Sermons for the Church's Year*. 154 pp. (Mowbray). 4s.

MISCELLANEOUS.

NORWICH, Bp. OF.—*The Nation and the Nation's Worship* 38 pp. (Eyre & Spottiswoode). 1s.

DAVIS, J. MERLE.—*Modern Industry and the African*, 425 pp. (Macmillan), 12s. 6d.

The Oxford Handbook of Religious Knowledge, 351 pp. (S.P.C.K.). 3s. 6d.

RAVEN, CHARLES E.—*Liverpool Cathedral*, 35 pp. (Oxford Univ. Press). 2s. 6d.

WRIGHT, I.—*A Key to a New World*, 112 pp. (C. W. Daniel). 4s. 6d.

SEAVER, G.—*Edward Wilson of the Antarctic*, 299 pp. (John Murray). 10s. 6d.

ROYDEN, A. M.—*Here and Hereafter*, 292 pp. (Putnam). 7s. 6d.

PALMER, E. J.—*The Challenge of an Indian Experience*, 36 pp. (Blackwell). 1s.

HEGEMAN, W.—*Christ Rescued*, 223 pp. (Skeffington). 6s.

LINDSAY, A. D.—*Christianity and Economics*, 177 pp. (Macmillan). 5s.

MATTHEWS, B.—*World Tides in the Far East*, 160 pp. (Edinburgh House Press), 2s.

EVANS, R. O.—*Ruthin Lodge*, 276 pp. (Stockwell). 6s.
RADHAKRISHNAN, S.—*East and West in Religion*, 146 pp. (Allen & Unwin). 4s. 6d.
PECK, W. E.—*The Social Implications of the Oxford Movement*, 346 pp. (Scribners).
HENSON, H. H.—*The Group Movement*, 2nd edition, 82 pp. (Oxford Univ. Press). 2s. 6d.

GERMAN BOOKS.

VOGELSANG, E.—*Luthers Kampf gegen die Juden*, 35 pp. (J. C. B. Mohr, Tübingen). 1.50 marks.
KURZ, A.—*Die Heilsgewissheit bei Luther*, xii+262 pp. (C. Bertelsmann, Gütersloh). 8 marks.
FRISCHMUTH, G.—*Die Paulinische Konzeption in der Frommingkeit Bernhards von Clairvaux*, 383 pp. (Bertelsmann). 3.20 marks.
SCHMIDT, H.—*Luther und das Buch der Psalmen*, 60 pp. (Mohr). 1.50 marks.
ALTHAUS, P.—*Die Letzten Dinge*, 351 pp. (Bertelsmann). 10 marks.
LEITZMANN, H.—*Die Liturgie des Theodor von Mopsuestia*, 24 pp. (W de Gruyter, Berlin). 2 marks.
DALMAN, G.—*Arbeit und Sitte in Pälestina*, III, 339 pp. (Bertelsmann). 20.50 marks.

THE
CHURCH QUARTERLY REVIEW

FOR
OCTOBER 1933 : JANUARY 1934

EDITED BY
PHILIP USHER

VOLUME CXVII

THE CHURCH QUARTERLY REVIEW
14, BURLEIGH STREET
LONDON, W.C.2

1934

C O N T E N T S

—O—

THE ORDINATION OF WOMEN TO THE PRIESTHOOD. By Mrs. W. C. Roberts and Lord Hugh Cecil	I
ARCHBISHOP WHITGIFT AND THE LAMBETH ARTICLES. By Beatrice M. Hamilton Thompson	25
GRACE IN THE NEW TESTAMENT. By Robert Winkler	52
COLLEGE CHAPELS. By Adam Fox	89
SMALL BEER OF HISTORY. By R. H. Gibbon	100
THE LIMITS OF THE CHURCH. By George Florovsky	117
SCIENCE AND RELIGION IN CONTEMPORARY CULTURE. By F. L. CROSS	132
REVIEWS	145
SHORT NOTICES	192
PERIODICALS AND BOOKS RECEIVED	201
SPIRITUAL HEALING. By Douglas McLaren	209
THE KING OF TYRE. By Cameron Mackay	239
THE REJECTED CHRIST. By Wilfrid Richmond	259
JOHN BRAMHALL. By Charles Nye	267
CORIOLANUS AND SHAKESPEARE'S "TRAGIC COURSE." By Geraldine Hodgson	292
SAINT STEPHEN AND THE ROMAN COMMUNITY AT THE TIME OF THE BAPTISMAL CONTROVERSY. By N. Zernov	304
CHURCH CRISIS IN GERMANY	337
REVIEWS	350
SHORT NOTICES	364
PERIODICALS AND BOOKS RECEIVED	385
INDEX	393

INDEX TO VOL. CXVII.

AN INTRODUCTION TO THE SOCIOLOGY OF ISLAM. By Levy, reviewed, 381.

ADVENTURES OF IDEAS. By Whitehead, reviewed, 375.

ARCHBISHOP WHITGIFT AND THE LAMBETH ARTICLES. Article by Beatrice M. Hamilton Thompson, 25.

CALVIN. By Carew Hunt, reviewed, 354.

CALVINISM AND EVANGELISM IN ENGLAND, ESPECIALLY AMONG THE BAPTISTS. By Whitly, reviewed, 192.

CAMBRIDGE MEDIEVAL HISTORY, THE. VOL. VII. DECLINE OF EMPIRE AND PAPACY. Cambridge University Press, reviewed, 161.

CHRISTIAN AND THE NEXT WAR, THE. By Goff, reviewed, 374.

CHRISTIAN MARRIAGE: AN HISTORICAL AND DOCTRINAL STUDY. By Joyce, reviewed, 152.

CHRISTIAN RENAISSANCE, THE. By Wilson Knight, reviewed, 356.

CHURCH AND PEOPLE. By Carpenter, reviewed, 183.

CHURCH CRISIS IN GERMANY, 337.

COLLEGE CHAPELS. Article by Fox, 89.

CORIOLANUS AND SHAKESPEARE'S "TRAGIC COURSE." Article by Geraldine Hodgson, 292.

COUNCIL OF TRENT AND ANGLICAN FORMULARIES, THE. By Symonds, reviewed, 367.

COUNTER-REFORMATION, THE. By Kidd, reviewed, 352.

DIE ALTORIENTALISCHE WEISHEIT IN IHRER ISRAELITISCH-JUDISCHEN AUSPRAGUNG. By FICHTNER, reviewed, 365

DRAMA OF THE MEDIAEVAL CHURCH, THE. By Young, reviewed, 172.

EPISTLE TO THE ROMANS, THE. By Barth, reviewed, 359.

EVANGELICAL INFLUENCE IN ENGLISH LIFE. By Bishop of Barking, reviewed, 193.

FORMATION OF THE GOSPEL TRADITION, THE. By Taylor, reviewed, 145.

FOUNDATIONS OF THE PHILOSOPHY OF VALUE. By Osborne, reviewed, 195.

GOSPEL OF MODERNISM, THE. By Richardson, reviewed, 379.

GRACE IN THE NEW TESTAMENT. Article by Winkler, 52.

HISTORIC OCCASIONS IN WESTMINSTER ABBEY. By Storr and Perkins, reviewed, 375.

HISTORY OF POLITICAL THOUGHT, A. By Doyle, reviewed, 350.

HISTORY OF THE VULGATE IN ENGLAND FROM ALCUIN TO ROGER BACON. By Glunz, reviewed, 371.

HOUSE OF THE SPIRIT, THE: THE CONTEMPLATIVE LIFE FOR LAY-People. By Pohl, reviewed, 199.

ISRAELITISCHE UND ALTORIENTALISCHE WEISHEIT. By Baumgartner, reviewed, 364.

ITALY AND THE REFORMATION TO 1550. By Brown, reviewed, 369.

JESUS: A NEW OUTLINE AND ESTIMATE. By Bouquet, reviewed, 382.

JOHN BRAMHALL. Article by Nye, 267.

KING OF TYRE, THE. Article by Cameron Mackay, 239.

LIFE AND TEACHING OF JESUS CHRIST, THE. By Raven and Raven, reviewed, 383.

LIFE OF JOHN COLET, THE. By Marriott, reviewed, 192.

LIMITS OF THE CHURCH, THE. Article by Florovsky, 117.

LITERATURE AND PULPIT IN MEDIEVAL ENGLAND. By Owst, reviewed, 165.

MEMORIALS UPON SEVERAL OCCASIONS. Published by Mowbray, reviewed, 383.

MODERN THOUGHT ON TRIAL. By Ingram, reviewed, 377.

NORTHERN CATHOLICISM : STUDIES IN THE OXFORD CENTENARY AND PARALLEL MOVEMENTS. By Williams and Harris, reviewed, 176.

ORDINATION OF WOMEN TO THE PRIESTHOOD, THE. Article by Roberts and Cecil, 1.

OTHER HALF, THE. By Wilson, reviewed, 197.

PHILOSOPHY OF RELIGION, A. By Czako, reviewed, 194.

PLACE OF MINDS IN THE WORLD, THE. By Mitchell, reviewed, 156.

PUBLIC SCHOOL RELIGION. By Lunn, reviewed, 361.

REJECTED CHRIST, THE. Article by Wilfrid Richmond, 259.

RELIGIOUS PHILOSOPHY OF BARON VON HUGEL, THE. By Lester-Garland, reviewed, 157.

ROMAN CHURCH AND THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND, THE. By Malden, reviewed, 192.

SAINT FRANCIS OF THE HOP FIELDS. By Sargeant, reviewed, 197.

SAINT STEPHEN AND THE ROMAN COMMUNITY AT THE TIME OF THE BAPTISMAL CONTROVERSY. Article by Zernov, 304.

SCIENCE AND RELIGION IN CONTEMPORARY CULTURE. Article by Cross, 132.

SHI'ITE RELIGION : A HISTORY OF ISLAM IN PERSIA AND IRAQ. By Donaldson, reviewed, 380.

SIDONIUS APOLLINARIS AND HIS AGE. By Stevens, reviewed, 372.

SMALL BEER OF HISTORY. Article by Gibbon, 100.

SPIRITUAL HEALING. Article by McLaren, 209.

SURVEY OF MYSTICAL SYMBOLISM, A. By Ewer, reviewed, 188.

THIRD OECUMENICAL COUNCIL AND THE PRIMACY OF THE BISHOP OF ROME, THE. By Faith Press, reviewed, 197.

WHAT IT MEANS TO BE A CHRISTIAN. By Headlam, reviewed, 149.

WORTEMPFANG UND SYMBOL IN DER ALTTESTAMENTLICHEN PROPHETIE. By Haeussermann, reviewed, 366.



BY APPOINTMENT.

A BRITISH INDUSTRY.

FRANCIS TUCKER & Co. Ltd.
HAVE BEEN RENOWNED FOR
200 YEARS
AS THE MOST RELIABLE MAKERS OF
CHURCH CANDLES
OF EVERY DESCRIPTION.

Sanctuary Oil, Wicks and Floats, Incense, Charcoal, Brasswork, Glassware, and all Church Requisites of the Finest Quality are also supplied.

PRICE LIST on application to:—

The Manufactory, Cricklewood Lane, N.W.2 }
31 Ashley Place, Westminster, S.W.1 } LONDON
or 26 & 28 Manchester St., Liverpool & 118 Clyde St., Glasgow.

HOW TO READ THE BIBLE WITH PROFIT

The Church Bible Study Union

WARDEN:

THE VERY REV. THE DEAN OF CHICHESTER

Founded for the promotion of

SYSTEMATIC AND DEVOTIONAL BIBLE STUDY

The Union issues a Magazine

THE DAILY MESSAGE

Founder and Hon. Editor:

REV. R. WOOD-SAMUEL

in which a passage from one of the Daily Lessons is chosen for each day's study, and a brief exposition is given upon it, with application to the daily life of the Christian. There are many Parochial branches in town and country parishes; and the Magazine is supplied to them on reduced terms. Others can have it by post, cost 1s. 6d. per year. Clergy and laity are strongly recommended to see a specimen copy of the Magazine, which can be had by sending a post card to:

The Secretary, Daily Message, 14, Burleigh Street, London W.C.2.

Before
arranging
your
INSURANCES

Consult

THE
**LONDON &
LANCASHIRE**
INSURANCE CO.

LTD

Fire
Accident
Motor Car, etc.

SUPREME SECURITY

Chief Administration :
7, Chancery Lane, London